United Nations S/PV.7629

Security Council

Seventy-first year

Provisional

7629th meeting

Tuesday, 23 February 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Ramírez Carreño	(Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))
Members:	Angola	Mr. Gaspar Martins
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulatta
	France	Mr. Lamek
	Japan	Mr. Yoshikawa
	Malaysia	Mr. Ibrahim
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Senegal	Mr. Seck
	Spain	Mr. Gasso Matoses
	Ukraine	Mr. Yelchenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Mr. Pressman
	Uruguay	Mr. Rosselli

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture

Letter dated 1 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/104)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture

Letter dated 1 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/104)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the following to participate in this meeting: His Excellency Mr. Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; His Excellency Mr. Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative of Sweden and former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; and His Excellency Mr. Gert Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the following to participate in this meeting: Mrs. Louise Sharene Bailey, Adviser at the Permanent Observer Mission of the African Union to the United Nations; His Excellency Mr. Gonzalo Koncke, Permanent Observer of the Organization of American States to the United Nations; and Mr. Carl Hallergard, Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations.

I propose that the Council invite the Permanent Observer of the Observer State of the Holy See to the United Nations to participate in this meeting, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and previous practice in that regard.

It is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2016/104, which contains the text of a letter dated 1 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept note on the item under consideration.

I now give the floor to Mr. Kamau.

Mr. Kamau: First, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, for your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February 2016, as well as to commend you on the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of the Council. I thank you for organizing this timely open debate of the Security Council on peacebuilding and for circulating an informative concept note (S/2016/104, annex) to guide us. I also thank you for the initiative of inviting me to address the Security Council in my capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission.

We at the Peacebuilding Commission welcome very much not only the opportunity to be here but also the concept note that you, Sir, circulated for our debate today. The note clearly spells out some of the crucial challenges that peacebuilding is facing and why we must redouble our efforts at better peacebuilding within the collective United Nations family. We agree with your note that the Security Council and the General Assembly have acknowledged, for some time now, that the Peacebuilding Commission can contribute to the prevention of the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, as acknowledged by the landmark resolution 2171 (2014) on conflict prevention, adopted in 2014. The Peacebuilding Commission and its configurations continue to work in that vein, and we remain thankful for the support and acknowledgement we receive from the Council in that regard.

This debate comes at a crucial moment. As you, Mr. President, point out in your concept note, the reviews of the peacebuilding architecture under consideration in the Security Council and in the General Assembly call upon Member States to see peacebuilding in a broader perspective and to face it with greater determination. The review of the peacebuilding architecture is currently in its final stages, and the United Nations is being called to re-examine its entire approach to peacebuilding in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), which we all adopted in 2015, while remaining true to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. I shall highlight some of salient elements of the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture that I believe deserve the particular attention of the Council and of the wider membership.

First, the report of the Advisory Group of Experts, entitled "Challenge of sustaining peace", reiterates the need for a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and sustainable peace. In my understanding, the report does not introduce a new concept but merely restates what we all know needs to be done to achieve lasting peace — the main purpose for which the United Nations was created. Its key message is a lesson we have all learned over the years, namely, that investments in the prevention of the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict are considerably less expensive and more sustainable than merely reacting to crises.

Secondly, the current review comes at a time when there have been increasing calls pressing for the need to address the fragmentation in the United Nations system's efforts and a growing unanimity on the importance of building coherence in our collective efforts across the peace and security, development and human rights engagement of the United Nations at the intergovernmental and operational levels. The Peacebuilding Commission, in its advisory role to the Security Council, stands ready to serve as a bridge between the Security Council and other principal intergovernmental organizations, with a view to strengthening the collaboration and enhancing the impact of their collective peacebuilding work in the world.

Thirdly, building lasting peace requires predictable, sustained and adequate financing to address the root causes of conflict. According to the report of the Advisory Group, while countries emerging from conflict require significant financing over extended periods, funding is often channelled into short-term emergency responses that would produce immediate tangible results. That dilemma often invites the obvious question of whether there could be a reduced need for emergency conflict responses if peacebuilding and prevention efforts were prioritized. The United Nations experience shows the critical role that peacebuilding efforts and the Peacebuilding Commission can play in the mobilization of long-term and sustained international support to critical national capacity needs.

The role of the Peacebuilding Fund in providing financing to countries at their request has evidently been important, but remains, by far, limited in its impact. Clearly, the Fund needs to be enhanced. Currently, multi-donor pooled funds for peacebuilding seem to be the single most attractive option for peacebuilding. However, we would like to call upon all Member States, including non-traditional donors and other partners, to consider making or increasing their multi-year commitments to pooled funds in support of sustainable peace.

Furthermore, all financing-related proposals in the report of the Advisory Group, including those aimed at appropriately resourcing peacebuilding programmes during transitions, need to be comprehensively considered by Member States during the current review. We need to address the predictability and sustainability of financing. We must consider all the viable options available to maximize the potential and the predictability of the Peacebuilding Fund.

The importance of enhanced partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, as well as with international financial institutions, in building peace cannot be overemphasized. The African Union and European Union (EU) in particular are among the strategic partners, as Africa remains important to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts. We shall work closely with the African Union, the EU and other regional organizations to ensure that peacebuilding initiatives are not only regionally owned and reflect the interests and needs of local populations, but are also regionally anchored and internationally supported based on each other's comparative advantages. The importance of strengthening World Bank-United Nations collaboration as a way to promote sustainable peace and channel resources to peacebuilding is something we intend to deepen alongside collaboration with regional financial institutions such as the African Development Bank.

But while Africa continues to be the priority destination for peacebuilding activities, we would not wish to create the impression here that only Africa is crying out for peacebuilding interventions. Anyone who reads the daily newspapers knows that Africa has no monopoly on violence and the absence of peace, on the contrary. As time moves on, we will need to ask ourselves what more the Peacebuilding Commission can and could do in other parts of the world to deepen the roots of peace and help stop violence.

As we work together to operationalize the outcome of the review of the peacebuilding architecture, we shall need to develop the links between our collective efforts to build sustainable peace and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In doing so, the Peacebuilding Commission, working with the Peacebuilding Support Office and the United Nations Development Group, will continue to look for ways to entrench its peacebuilding efforts in the relevant aspects of the work of the United Nations and the upcoming quadrennial comprehensive policy review, which presents a very good opportunity to deepen that relationship.

In conclusion, I am fully aware of the high expectations for a more effective Peacebuilding Commission. The Peacebuilding Commission will work to leverage the collective weight of its membership, particularly with the members of the Security Council, and to bring together partners, regional organizations, United Nations system actors, academia, civil society and non-governmental organizations, including women's organizations, to contribute to greater coherence and commitment to building sustainable peace. Together we will be able to, first, mobilize attention to drivers and root causes of conflicts that contribute to preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflicts; secondly, bring greater focus and priority to the regional dimension of building sustainable peace and provide a platform to promote the perspectives of regional actors; and, thirdly, but not least, provide political support to the practical integration of security, political, human rights and developmental responses over medium- to long-term engagements.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Kamau for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Skoog.

Mr. Skoog: I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this timely debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. I also want to thank you for the invitation to brief the Security Council this morning.

I have been a firm supporter of the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts from the start, and I wish to pay tribute to Ambassador Gert Rosenthal and his colleagues for their excellent work on that Review. I am confident that the review can bring real change to the Organization.

In your concept note (S/2016/104, annex), Mr. President, you remind us of the fact that the notion of peacebuilding was introduced by former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his report "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111). I would like take this opportunity to express our recognition of his services to world peace and international order.

Equally important, the concept note reminds us of the conceptual shift in our thinking on peacebuilding, acknowledged by both the Council and the General Assembly. Peacebuilding can no longer be confined to post-conflict recovery. Sustaining peace encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outburst, resurgence and continuation of conflict. Validating and solidifying this shift in mindset and endorsing a corresponding change in the way the United Nations system is set up to respond to conflict is the single most important outcome of the peacebuilding review. That is why this debate is so timely, as we Member States are in the midst of defining how to turn the normative developments and the political momentum into concrete reforms for a better operational response.

Today, I would like to focus my remarks on the following areas. First, I will share some conclusions from my chairmanship of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I will then touch upon what I believe are key areas in the review, namely, conflict prevention, financing for sustaining peace and the role of regional organizations.

I have had the great fortune and honour to chair the Peacebuilding Commission during a dynamic year. The review of the peacebuilding architecture provided a stimulating backdrop to our work. It gave the Commission an opportunity to test in practice how we can improve delivery and become more useful — because, as the review rightly pointed out, the Peacebuilding Commission has yet to fully deliver on the expectations as conceived at its establishment. The Commission is quite a unique structure at the United Nations, as well as a flexible body. I believe there are inherent opportunities for the Commission to keep evolving and to adopt new approaches, and thereby to come closer to fulfilling its original vision of bridging the gap between crisis response and long-term development and sustainable peace.

At the outset of our chairmanship, we set out a number of objectives for the work of the Commission, including adopting more transparent and strategic working methods, a more flexible agenda, increasing inclusivity and improving partnerships with regional and subregional organizations. We convened several regional and country-specific discussions concerning situations outside of the PBC regular agenda.

I have also come to appreciate that the mandate of the Commission has never been more relevant or important. Only by addressing the root causes of conflict, investing in socioeconomic development and building national capacities will there be lasting peace. The Peacebuilding Commission has a fundamentally important role in championing those long-term and comprehensive approaches. I believe we have a collective duty to make the PBC as effective as it can be, especially as the demand for more effective international response to conflicts remains high.

That brings me to my first message, concerning the prevention of conflict. There are no excuses for not heeding the call coming out consistently across the three reviews on United Nations peace operations. We must move the prevention of conflict to the centre of our work. To do so, we must better equip all parts of the United Nations system to contribute to sustaining peace, including the United Nations development system. That entails recognizing that peacebuilding is an inherently political process that requires sound political analysis and corresponding conflict-sensitive programming. Above all, it requires adequate political and financial support within the Organization, which brings me to my second message.

If we are serious about sustaining peace, we need to make sure there are resources to back up our priorities, as the Chair just said. It is a tragic irony that, while resources available for peacekeeping and humanitarian response amount to billions of dollars, conflict-prevention initiatives, which could save so many lives and significantly lessen the need for peacekeeping in the first place, has to scramble for a fraction of those amounts. I understand that there are sensitivities around some of the recommendations pertaining to increased financing, related to assessed contributions. In my view, we need to look at every option. But no matter what we agree on in a particular resolution, we should simultaneously look beyond United Nations mechanisms and find innovative ways of adequately resourcing peacebuilding efforts. Part of that involves strengthening national capacity for domestic revenue-regeneration. We can help decrease dependence on external resources, which in turn strengthens national leadership and ownership of development.

The United Nations does not operate in a vacuum and is not always the best-placed actor to address threats to peace. My third message today is therefore that we need to create stronger partnerships with regional actors and to strengthen their capacity, since they are often first responders to conflict. By partnering with regional and subregional organizations, the United Nations response will be better informed by local perspectives and better able to bring such understandings and approaches to peacebuilding to the fore.

Before concluding, let me add a final thought on a very positive development recently, namely, the recognition of the role of young people in peacebuilding. This agenda is not an add-on, an optional tick-in-the-box exercise. It is about tapping into and drawing upon the tremendous potential of young people as a positive source for peace, in particular in conflict-affected countries, where youth often make up the majority of the population and where risk factors around youth unemployment tend to overshadow the notion of youth as making potential contributions. By taking forward resolution 2250 (2015), stewarded by Jordan, and by adopting more inclusive approaches, we will make sure that their voices are heard.

I am very grateful to have been invited to address the Council on several occasions during the past year. I can only encourage the Security Council to reach out to the Peacebuilding Commission more actively and to look to the Peacebuilding Commission as a body that can complement and add value to the Council's work through a comprehensive approach to sustaining peace.

Lastly, while I might have stepped down from the chairmanship of the PBC, my commitment and, more important, the commitment of the Swedish Government to sustaining peace, to multilateralism and to the United Nations remains as strong as ever. The Council can count on us, as we together take the necessary steps to implement these reforms aimed at building a more effective United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Skoog for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Rosenthal (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you, Mr. President, for having invited me to participate in this open debate of the Security Council and for the concept note (S/2016/104, annex) that you have presented to us. Speaking first in a personal capacity, I am pleased to be back in the Chamber, where my last appearance was as a representative of a Member State, a little over two years ago.

I shall now speak on behalf of the seven members of the Advisory Group of Experts.

(*spoke in English*)

In a five-minute statement, I can touch only on some of the most salient features of what is now known as the report (see S/2015/4990) of the Advisory Group of Experts. As will be recalled, the report was initiated by Member States through a joint resolution of the Security Council and the General Assembly. That is as it should be, because what we conventionally think of as peacebuilding has roots in the mandates of not only the Council but also of the two other principal inter-governmental organs. We will also recall that the review of the peacebuilding activities of the United Nations contemplated two phases. Our report provides the collective and unvarnished opinion of seven independent specialists on how the United Nations is performing its peacebuilding activities. Our rather critical conclusions and recommendations are aimed at improving that performance. What are our main conclusions?

First, we need to rethink what we mean by peacebuilding. Both of the previous briefers touched upon that. In fact, in the agenda items of the Council the term is always preceded by the adjective post-conflict. In spite of the fact that the Council recognized as early as 2001 that peacebuilding can and should occur during the full cycle of conflict — before, during and post — we keep addressing the matter as something that should occur after the guns fall silent, which unfortunately has meant its relegation to the end of the line in priority-setting. We propose the term "sustainable peace" as preferable and as the needed evolution in mindset, but any other expression will do. The main point is that the United Nations as a whole must put a much greater accent on preventive measures. In fact, much of the present peacebuilding efforts aim to address root causes in the broader context of pre-empting a lapse or relapse into violent conflict. The determination in 2005 was to ensure that such efforts became central. But we found that, regrettably, that has not been the case.

Secondly, what makes that broader view somewhat dysfunctional in relation to the present arrangements regarding the purview of each of the principal inter-governmental organs is that we seem to live in a culture of virtual silos. As we all know, the Security Council deals with international peace and security, and the General Assembly and Economic and Social Council address, among other aspects, issues that fall in the domain of the human rights and development pillars. But distinct areas of preventing conflict or dealing with post-conflict situations fall within the purview of different organs. In our report, we stress the need for all three organs to discharge their responsibilities in a coordinated and coherent manner, each keeping within the confines of its mandates. We believe that the Peacebuilding Commission, in its capacity as an advisory body to all organs, can play a key role in proposing how that coordination can be brought about in operational and practical terms. Those include regularly convening a broader array of actors for inclusive conversations about the challenges of sustaining peace over the longer-term and distilling that advice for the use of all organs.

Thirdly, our discussions on peacebuilding centre too much on the institutional and organizational aspects in New York, when building sustainable peace can happen only on the ground — where we found that, in spite of some progress achieved towards delivering as one, the United Nations still faces very serious challenges in enhancing its effectiveness and relevance.

Fourthly — and this is something obvious, but not always sufficiently understood — reconciliation, capacity-building, institution-building and strategic planning can take only place in situ, led by domestic stakeholders through what we call inclusive national ownership. The United Nations can enable, but it cannot build, peace on its own.

Fifthly, the United Nations is usually not the only, or even often the most important, external actor in peacebuilding situations. It must improve its capacity to partner with regional organizations, as well as with bilateral and multilateral financial institutions. It must also interact with non-State actors that are present at the request of the host Government and with domestic stakeholders.

Sixthly, peacebuilding requires long-term development financing, which will invariably be a good investment owing to its intrinsic benefits and to the degree that it contributes to preventing conflicts. The United Nations will not be called upon to be a source of significant financial assistance, but clearly it can be hugely important as a catalyst for such assistance, especially through more intense use of the Peacebuilding Fund.

Finally, the report includes numerous specific recommendations to round out the points I have mentioned, but I cannot delve into those owing to the lack of time. I should mention, however, that our recommendations are not limited to the institutions established in 2005; they cover as well detailed policies to make the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office useful elements in a systemic approach on the part of the United Nations to achieve what we call sustainable peace. I should end by stating that our conceptual framework is very much consistent with Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). In other words, we place peacebuilding in the broader context of the United Nations central mission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Rosenthal for his briefing.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Aboulatta (Egypt): I have the honour to deliver this joint statement on behalf of the delegations of Egypt, Spain and Ukraine. For the purpose of brevity and efficiency, a more detailed written version of this statement will be circulated.

We would like to commend you, Mr. President, for having organized this debate on the theme "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture", at a critical juncture in the intergovernmental process of the peacebuilding review. The ongoing review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture takes place at a defining moment for the Organization. With the increasing number of violent conflicts and their changing nature, the existing tools and approaches that the United Nations uses and applies in its response are being called into question. Hence the need for Member States and the United Nations leadership to consider measures leading to real change in the prevailing mindset within the United Nations, and also for strengthening the capacity of the broader United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We hope that this debate will contribute to reaching consensus on such measures through the intergovernmental process.

The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, prepared under the leadership of Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, concludes that, unless we succeed in breaking the barriers within the Organization between the principle organs of the United Nations and between and within the Secretariat, agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations, we will fail the people that we have been mandated to serve. It is in the Council's interest to consider, with urgency, measures to discourage the division and fragmentation of approaches, in order to protect the multi-billion dollar investment we have in peacekeeping missions against the risk of lapse or relapse into conflict. In recent memory, the tragic cases of South Sudan and the Central African Republic serve as stark illustrations of such risks.

The United Nations system must give priority to enabling countries to put in place effective and inclusive national and local mechanisms and institutions that can address the socioeconomic and political root causes and drivers of violent conflict, including issues related to the promotion and protection of human rights and the assignment of a prominent role for women in all stages of peace consolidation. That will be the most effective way to pursue prevention. It is therefore imperative to introduce policies, structures and mandates that primarily cater to the development capacity of national stakeholders.

Preventive diplomacy also represents a major tool of deterrence that the Security Council should deploy more frequently. It should do that by utilizing the good offices of the Secretary-General and his mandated responsibility to draw the Council's attention to situations that could threaten international peace and security, and by utilizing partnerships with regional and subregional organizations. To that end, we believe that the Council must recommit to the spirit of Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, thereby making a critical contribution to the building and sustaining of peace. In that vein, the Council should consistently respond to the requests of parties for assistance in the implementation of peace agreements. The most recent response to the request from Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia serves as a good example for future Council contributions to the prevention of relapse into conflict.

Despite the commendable contributions made over the past decade by the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office to maintaining our attention on situations and needs that would otherwise have fallen off the radar, we must plead guilty to having underutilized those tools. We must seize the opportunity offered by the three reviews of United Nations peacekeeping operations to ensure that the three components of our broader peacebuilding architecture play a more central role in catalyzing political commitment on the part of Member States to promoting coherence within and beyond the United Nations system and in mobilizing human and financial resources.

With the reforms proposed by the report of the Advisory Group of Experts with regard to the working methods and functions of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Security Council should draw upon the Advisory Group's advice when a situation with which the Council is seized is no longer characterized as a crisis but should still be considered fragile and deserving of more dedicated, targeted and sustained attention.

Peacebuilding-related investments should start early as the opportunities emerge throughout the arc of a crisis. That will help build the foundation for an inclusive political settlement and for key institutions early on. More predictable funding for a broad range of early and targeted engagement remains critical for building and sustaining peace. In that regard, we believe that the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Group deserve greater circulation and serious consideration on the part of Member States.

We truly hope that we can soon reach consensus on a draft resolution that will formalize the review and authorize efforts to effect the needed changes. However, no resolution stands a chance of making a real difference unless all Member States and the seniormost leadership of the United Nations stand ready to renew their commitment to saving this and succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

As we recently paid tribute to Boutrous Boutrous Ghali, I will conclude with a quote from his 1992 "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping":

> "Reform is a continuing process, and improvement can have no limit ... The pace set must therefore be increased if the United Nations is to keep ahead of the acceleration of history that characterizes this age. We must be guided not by precedents alone, however wise these may be, but by the needs of the future and by the shape and content that we wish to give it." (*S/24111, para. 85*)

Mr. Gaspar Martius (Angola): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and Venezuela for convening this timely and important debate on the theme "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture", as we are in the final stages of the intergovernmental process to which we, Angola and Australia have been appointed by the Presidents of General Assembly and the Security Council respectively. As already mentioned, a draft resolution is under negotiation, and we aim to secure its adoption soon by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in conformity with the mandate received from the Presidents of the General Assembly and Security Council.

I am very pleased to see Ambassador Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, back in the Council Chamber, and I thank him for sharing with the Council his views on how we should move forward regarding peacebuilding. The Advisory Panel's excellent report (see S/2015/490) provides a comprehensive assessment of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. I would also like to thank my friends Ambassador Macharia Kamau and Ambassador Olof Skoog, current and previous Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission. I am very pleased that they have shared their views with the Council to guide our debate this morning.

Finally, when I look at the list of Member States whose representatives inscribed their names to participate in this open debate, I am also pleased to see that the membership believes that our theme has great significance, both for the Council's work and for the international community itself. The maintenance of peace is indeed what we need to do.

In establishing the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office 10 years ago, the General Assembly and the Security Council had as their objective to provide the United Nations with the institutional, financial and structural capacity to support countries emerging from conflict. The Peacebuilding Commission has played an important role in assisting States on its agenda and is a forum for sharing of experiences, best practices and expertise in post-conflict situations.

In a world facing continuous threats to peace and the proliferation of conflicts, regular reviews of the peacebuilding architecture are critical to ensuring that the United Nations system is adapted to contemporary challenges. As such, we would like to focus on two aspects stressed in the report of the Advisory Group, namely, the need for a change in mindset with regard to the role of peacebuilding in the United Nations system and the need to adjust the approaches to peacebuilding.

As the report of the Advisory Group points out, in the report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) peacebuilding is a logical follow-up to peacekeeping and peacemaking, with a main objective of preventing a relapse into conflict once a peace settlement had been secured. According to the Advisory Group, the new mindset in peacebuilding should be based on the concept of sustaining peace, built on a vision that peacebuilding is aimed at preventing the outbreak and recurrence of armed conflict, and therefore encompasses a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights programmes and mechanisms. Sustaining peace is a permanent undertaking before, during and after conflict.

With regard to the responsibility of the United Nations system, and based on the outlined objectives, peacebuilding covers the three pillars and the main organs of the United Nations whose activity is devoted to the prevention of armed conflict and the maintenance of peace, while promoting the high values and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. In the past 10 years, the Peacebuilding Commission has been striving to connect the activities of those organs by identifying the root causes of conflict, creating a favourable environment for trust among parties to a conflict, strengthening States' capacities and promoting the inclusive participation of a wide range of national stakeholders.

In Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Kosovo, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone, the United Nations has helped to consolidate peace by promoting inclusive socioeconomic development, economic growth, poverty eradication, the rule of law and human rights. As part of the United Nations comprehensive activities, peacebuilding must be understood as an evolving concept based on the need to constantly adapt to the reality on the ground. That has been stressed once again today. Peacebuilding takes place on the ground, where conflicts have to be dealt with, and must entail time frames for political transformation after violent conflict.

With regard to time frames, based on Angola's experience, we believe that the achievement of peace has a dynamic of its own. Each country has specificities that define the time needed to address root causes and avoid a relapse into conflict. In that regard, while facing delays in the political transition of a given country, the Security Council can either look into the deep-rooted causes of such delays and contribute constructively to address them, or adopt a rigid position by increasing pressure on the parties and seeking strict compliance with an agreed time frame and a negotiated peace settlement. We believe that by taking the appropriate time to resolve outstanding disputes and accepting the need to adapt the time frames of peace agreements to the existing challenges might significantly contribute to sustaining an unsustainable peace.

To conclude, I would like to like to once again underscore that which is at stake in the current review of the peacebuilding architecture, namely, the strategy of the United Nations system in addressing conflict prevention, the root causes of conflict and the creation of sustainable peaceful societies in a context of diversity, challenges and continuous threats to international peace and security. That is a goal that international authorities and international partners, including international, regional and subregional organizations, should address together through coordinated efforts. It is our shared responsibility, and this is the right time to fulfil it.

Mr. Van Bohemen (New Zealand): We thank the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for convening this meeting and thank the briefers — Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal.

In the past two decades, our understanding of what makes for effective peacebuilding has grown markedly. It is now accepted that effective political transitions and national reconciliation processes, the reform and strengthening of security and rule of law institutions and the creation of employment and economic opportunities can all be critical for sustaining peace. Similarly, as Ambassador Rosenthal again reminded us, and notwithstanding our post-conflict focus in the title of the agenda item, peacebuilding is now recognized as something that underlies every step in the conflict cycle, not only as something that follows at the end of conflict resolution and peacekeeping activities. We also better acknowledge now the central importance of national ownership to the long-term success of peacebuilding efforts. At the same time, we have learned a great deal about what not to do, and have identified areas where we need to do better. Today I will highlight four areas where New Zealand believes that we, as the Council, need to improve our collective performance.

First, we support the call by the Advisory Group of Experts for the Council to play a more active role in peacebuilding. In our view, the Council must focus on key areas of comparative advantage and integrate peacebuilding objectives into mission planning from the earliest stages. While the Council is not best-placed to provide overall leadership of United Nations peacebuilding efforts, it plays a critical role in mandating early peacebuilding tasks and mobilizing the necessary resources in many immediate post-conflict settings.

Secondly, there needs to be more consistent and meaningful engagement between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. New Zealand has been one of many countries to call for that since the Commission's establishment, in 2005. It should not be a question of powers or prerogatives; both the Commission and the Council benefit by sharing their knowledge and expertise. Making doctrinal distinctions between the two bodies' respective competencies is a barrier to the integrated, joined-up approach that should be our aim and should be the norm. We have been pleased to see positive examples, such as the briefing by the Chair of the Guinea-Bissau country-specific configuration during our discussions on the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS) last week (see S/PV.7624). We strongly support his involvement in the Council mission to Guinea-Bissau next week. We want to see greater engagement between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. Additionally, the Council could benefit from the Commission's advice on issues such as designing meaningful benchmarks to measure the completion of peacebuilding mandates.

Thirdly, as all of the briefers emphasized, the Council needs to better recognize the essential role of partnerships in achieving and sustaining peacebuilding gains, particularly in regard to institutional capacity-building. We still have some way to go to consistently achieve national ownership in practice. We support the recommendation of the Advisory Group to use mechanisms such as peacebuilding compacts to foster improved understanding and more meaningful ownership of programmes by national stakeholders. New Zealand has seen such agreements benefit regional peacebuilding missions in our own region.

Equally important is the need for better coordination with other peacebuilding actors — including United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, non-governmental organizations and bilateral donors — to promote coherence in international assistance. United Nations country teams have a central role to play in this regard, particularly during peace operation transitions, when coordination with longer-term development partners is critical for ensuring that peacebuilding gains are sustained beyond the life of the mission. We support the Advisory Group's recommendation to strengthen the offices of the Resident Coordinators during such transitions, even on a temporary basis, to assist with taking forward and reallocating the peacebuilding tasks of departing missions.

Fourthly, as others have also emphasized, the fragmentation of peacebuilding efforts across the United Nations system needs to be addressed. Competing mandates, funding sources and accountabilities can pose enormous challenges for achieving and sustaining unity of vision and effort across different United Nations entities.

The Advisory Group has outlined a range of recommendations to address this, including more integrated strategic planning, more accountable senior leadership and stronger peacebuilding expertise in critical areas. We encourage the Secretary-General to take these forward.

Let me conclude by commending the efforts of Australia and Angola as co-facilitators of the intergovernmental consultations on the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We look forward to considering a Security Council resolution in response to the review in the near future.

In the coming year, important decisions are expected with regard to the transitions in Liberia, Haiti and Côte d'Ivoire that will strongly influence the prospects for sustaining the hard-fought peacebuilding gains in those countries. Let us ensure that we draw on the lessons we have learned when making those decisions.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China appreciates the initiative of Venezuela to convene this open debate of the Security Council on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. I thank the Permanent Representative of Kenya, Ambassador Kamau; the Permanent Representative of Sweden, Ambassador Skoog; and Ambassador Rosenthal for their respective briefings.

A few days ago, we mourned with a heavy heart the passing of Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, former Secretary-General of the United Nations. In 1992, in his report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), he introduced the concept of peacebuilding. In 2005, the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted respective resolutions deciding to establish the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, marking a historic step by the United Nations in the area of peacebuilding.

In recent years, the United Nations peacebuilding architecture has been actively supporting reconstruction and State-building in post-conflict countries and assisted West African countries in coping with the Ebola epidemic. United Nations peacebuilding practices in countries such as Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste have already become success stories in this regard.

At present, regional conflicts are producing major spillover effects, and traditional and non-traditional security threats are interwoven. Some post-conflict countries are facing the risk of the resurgence of war. How to improve our work in the area of peacebuilding, consolidate the fruits of the process and achieve lasting peace are the major topics to be explored by the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

China would like to elaborate on the following points.

First, we must adhere to the "host-country-led and host-country-driven" principle. Peacebuilding efforts must be based on the consent of the host country and be tasked with enhancing the capacity-building capabilities of the host country; our goal should be to achieve lasting peace and stable development in the countries concerned. The international community must respect the sovereignty and ownership of post-conflict countries, give full play to the initiatives of the countries concerned and provide constructive support and assistance to these countries.

The idea that peacebuilding actions can take over most — or indeed even all — of the role that should be played by the host country Government is not desirable.

Secondly, the peacebuilding architecture should serve as a communication platform between the host country and the stakeholders of the international community. Peacebuilding is a systems project that includes multiple areas such as political, security and social development, and involves multiple actors, including the host-country Government, international financial institutions and regional organizations. International financial institutions should focus on helping the countries concerned to improve their capability to generate and mobilize resources and provide a solid basis for future development.

The African Union and other regional organizations should give full play to their geographical advantages and explore and formulate regional solutions for peacebuilding. The United Nations should enhance coordination and allow all actors to fully leverage their respective advantages and expertise, so as to create an effective division of labour and synergies.

Thirdly, we must proceed from the actual needs of the countries concerned and adopt a tailor-made approach. Post-conflict countries have different national realities. Even in the same country, peacebuilding needs and priorities may vary from one stage to another. When formulating work plans for peacebuilding, we must take into full consideration the local conditions, respect the views of the host country, pay attention to its actual needs and ensure that our plans and work are in full alignment with the overall national strategy and priority development areas. In the process of implementation, there should be regular evaluation of its effectiveness on the ground so that timely adjustments and additional measures can be taken in accordance with the needs of the host country.

Fourthly, we must attach importance to the communication and connection between peacebuilding and peacekeeping operations. In conflict-stricken countries where peacekeepers have been deployed, peacekeeping missions are familiar with the local situation and have access to a wealth of information and intelligence. United Nations peacebuilding efforts must focus on strengthening connections with peacekeeping operations so as to ensure the sharing of resources. In the final stage of a peacekeeping mission's lifespan, the mission should seek to ensure and maintain the lasting stability of the host country and enhance its communication with the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, so as to ensure that peacebuilding efforts can be carried out smoothly after the departure of the mission.

Fifthly, we must give full play to the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission. The PBC comprises members of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. The PBC is well informed in many areas and has an in-depth understanding of peacebuilding work in particular countries. The Peacebuilding Commission should consider further strengthening its ties with the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council so as to actively advice on issues such as the consolidation of peace, enhancing the capacity of host countries and developing country-specific mechanisms. The Security Council should enhance its communication with the PBC and its country-specific configurations so as to provide better guidance in this area.

Mr. Ibrahim (Malaysia): I join earlier speakers in thanking you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting, which represents a timely opportunity to take stock of the ongoing work on reviewing the peacebuilding architecture. I thank you also for the informative concept note (S/2016/104, annex). I wish also to thank the briefers, namely, ambassador Kamau of Kenya, Ambassador Skoog of Sweden and Ambassador Rosenthal for their respective presentations. As a current member of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Malaysia subscribes to a number of points and issues elaborated by the briefers. I wish also to further contribute to discussions with the following points.

As stressed by the briefers, 2015 and 2016 are crucial for the peacebuilding agenda, not least in respect of the ongoing peacebuilding architecture review process. I take this opportunity to express support for Angola and Australia in leading the ongoing intergovernmental negotiations on the review outcome. We are confident that the comprehensive, transparent and inclusive approach of the co-Chairs will yield an outcome that enjoys broad support and consensus among all Member States, partners and stakeholders.

The year 2015 saw a significant and positive shift in the PBC's approach, particularly with regard to its advocacy role. The Commission's engagement with States not on its formal agenda, namely, Burkina Faso, Papua New Guinea and Somalia, demonstrated that the PBC has the flexibility to engage outside a predetermined scope.

It is noteworthy that the Commission was early able to adopt a regional approach in supporting United Nations efforts to respond to the Ebola outbreak in West Africa. Such engagement indicates that the PBC possesses the latent ability to act in a preventive capacity.

It is important that the ongoing review exercise recognize this potential and consider the necessary measures to maintain or strengthen it further. We fully agree withe Ambassador Kamau's observations that in the long run investments in preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict are considerably less costly and sustainable than those associated with reacting and responding to crises. In the long term, strengthening the PBC's preventive capacity and role also contributes to deepening a culture of prevention within the United Nations system and on the shared Charter-mandated responsibility of sustaining peace.

The concurrent reviews of the peacebuilding architecture, of United Nations peace operations and of resolution 1325 (2000) present an opportunity to address the challenge of possible fragmentation as well as to promote better synergy, coordination and complementarity in the work of the relevant bodies, agencies and mechanisms of the United Nations towards achieving the core objective of promoting and sustaining peace. The three review processes share an underlying aspect, namely, the pursuit of an integrated approach that links development, human rights and security while remaining fully mindful of the primacy of politics in peacebuilding efforts and the peace process. In that context, my delegation wishes to underscore the linkages and the need for peacebuilding architecture review outcomes to be aligned with the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1).

The eradication of hunger and poverty, economic revitalizaton and stabilization, including by increasing the revenue-generating capacity of countries in transition, must be counted among the core objectives of peacebuilding initiatives. At the same time, we also support proposals to strengthen the participation of women and youth in peacebuilding. Therefore, overall peacebuilding efforts should incorporate inclusive approaches and policies involving all stakeholders of conflict-affected countries.

We also call for enhanced coordination and concerted efforts by United Nations agencies to address fragmentation and avoid working in silos, as reflected in the various reports of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission and resolution 1325 (2000). We furthermore believe that there is room in the review process for recommendations to enhance the PBC's engagement and collaboration with regional organizations and actors, as well as with international financial institutions, including through more effective partnerships with such actors.

In that regard, the conclusions emanating from the Commission's meeting on transition finance and peacebuilding in Somalia on 2 November 2015 could prove instructive. In recognizing the woeful state of funding for peacebuilding initiatives, Malaysia reaffirms its support for the recommendation of the Advisory Group of Experts that 1 per cent of total contributions to the United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions budgets be allocated to the Peacebuilding Fund, not only as a symbolic gesture but also as seed funding towards ensuring predictable and sustainable funding for future peacebuilding efforts and activities.

With a view to delivering as one, it is equally important that the relationship between the Commission and the Security Council be strengthened. Certain proposals on reinforcing the Commission's advisory role to the Security Council, including by increasing formal and informal dialogue, closer engagement with penholders and greater coordination and planning of all activities, including meetings and field visits with the Security Council presidency, can ensure that the Council integrates important peacebuilding objectives in its deliberations. In our view, that requires only procedural tweaks.

In conclusion, Malaysia believes that the present review process affords us a crucial opportunity to improve the mandate and function of the PBC, which is a unique entity with enormous potential. The review of the peacebuilding architecture must position the PBC so that it is better able to leverage its strengths in advocacy and in promoting and sustaining peace, not only in post-conflict scenarios but also in a preventive capacity. As such we are hopeful that the review outcome will be adopted in a timely manner with a view to enhancing the PBC's work, including in its relations with the Council.

Mr. Yoshikawa (Japan): I would like to begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to the Permanent Representatives of Kenya and Sweden — current and former Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) — as well as Ambassador Rosenthal, for sharing their insightful views with us.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

It is a great pleasure to see Ambassador Rosenthal here today.

(*spoke in English*)

I am also pleased to see the Permanent Representative of Brazil, also a former Chair of the PBC, in the Chamber today. I thank the Permanent Representative of Angola, who spoke earlier, and the Permanent Representative of Australia in moving the review process forward.

Thanks to the initiative of the Venezuelan presidency, we are meeting in an open format where both Security Council members and non-Council members are expressing their views. I find that most fitting, given the nature of today's topic. The long list of speakers and the large attendance in the Chamber today also demonstrate the high interest. Having chaired the PBC Working Group on Lessons Learned for the past two years and having now served in the Security Council for two months, I would like to make a few points on coordination between the Security Council and the PBC.

The PBC was establishsed jointly by the Security Council and the General Assembly out of the recognition that the three pillars of the United Nations — namely, peace and security, development and human rights — are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. The PBC was established to complement the peacebuilding efforts of United Nations institutions. Ten years have now passed since the PBC's establishment. Now is the time for us to make the Commission a body that can better perform its intended function as an advisory body to the Security Council.

In peacebuilding, the roles of the Security Council and the PBC are differentiated but complementary. The Security Council discharges its responsibility mainly in conflict resolution. The strength of the PBC, on the other hand, lies in its long-term endeavours to lay the groundwork for peace. During my chairmanship of the Working Group on Lessons-Learned, that is exactly what we intended to do by highlighting the PBC's strengths. The Group discussed challenges faced by post-conflict countries during and after United Nations mission draw-down and the importance of institution-building as a key priority in conflict-affected countries.

The Group was firmly convinced that strengthening core State institutions that provide security, justice, public administration and basic social services was fundamental to a successful transition from post-conflict situations to lasting peace. Such lessons learned and the remaining challenges are summarized in the two final reports of the Working Group on Lessons Learned. The reports are an embodiment of the PBC's mandated advisory role, and I hope they will be fully utilized in future discussions of the Security Council and the PBC, and in the ongoing review and beyond.

The PBC can be better employed for the prevention of lapses and relapses into conflicts as well. The PBC Chair and the Chairs of the country-specific configurations of the PBC can provide timely information and early warning to the Security Council. In that context, let me recall that inviting the PBC Chairs to Security Council meetings is something that has already been agreed in the past presidential notes in 2010 and 2013. The PBC Chairs should therefore be invited to participate in Security Council debates, in accordance with those notes, for greater coherence in peacebuilding efforts. I promise to do so during Japan's presidency.

If a conflict occurs, more resources and energy will be required. Securing sustained attention and resources for peacebuilding and conflict prevention is very important. There is no denying that the Peacebuilding Fund has proved itself to be an important financial tool for supporting critical peacebuilding processes in many post-conflict countries. Japan appreciates the Fund's active performance. Recognizing both the usefulness and the current difficulties faced by the Fund, Japan will contribute an additional $3.5 million to the Fund by the end of March. That will make our total contribution to the Fund $46 million. I wish to join the Chair of the PBC, Ambassador Kamau, in encouraging Member States, including non-traditional donors, to consider making voluntary contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund. That said, Japan does not believe in the "assessed contribution" option. We are concerned that the Fund's comparative advantage in being able to respond rapidly and flexibly would be greatly undermined if we were to choose that option.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to share with the Council what we wish to do during our Council presidency in the month of July. Our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Fumio Kishida, announced earlier today that Japan wishes to hold an open debate on the theme of peacebuilding in Africa in the month of July, and the Minister looks forward to presiding over the meeting himself. That will demonstrate Japan's dedication and determination to further contribute to greater coherence in United Nations peacebuilding efforts, both at the policy level and on the ground.

Mr. Seck (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I thank the President of the Security Council for having taken the initiative to organize this open debate on the theme, "Post-conflict peacebuilding, review of the peacebuilding architecture", and for also having provided a valuable concept note (S/2016/104, annex) to guide our discussion.

Allow me also to thank and congratulate the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Macharia Kamau; his predecessor in that eminent endeavour, Ambassador Olof Skoog; the Chair of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission and former Chair of the PBC, Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota; as well as the Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, for their significant contributions.

My delegation is pleased that this review has coincided with the full review of the United Nations peacekeeping operations, as well as the review of the implementation of the Security Council resolution on women and peace and security. The Organization must fully draw upon the singular opportunity offered by those reviews, which are so closely linked, so as to reorient our actions and strategies for a more coordinated and consistent approach and effectively tackle the numerous challenges to international peace and security.

The prevention of any return to war and the commitment to building peace in the long term so as to lastingly rehabilitate societies emerging from conflict were the basis for the concept and goal of creating the United Nations peacekeeping architecture. As early as in 1992, in "An Agenda for Peace", Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali — at that time Secretary-General of the United Nations — who has recently left us and to whom we would like to once again pay heartfelt tribute, defined post-conflict peacebuilding as

> "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" (*S/24111, para. 21*).

Although at that time peacebuilding was understood first and foremost in terms of military demobilization and political transition, the peacebuilding agenda and activities have continued to grow increasingly important and complex since then, with, in particular, the 1995 publication of Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali's supplement to "An Agenda for Peace" (S/1995/1) and, more significantly, with the implementation in 2005 of the Peacebuilding Commission architecture.

Those tools have certainly allowed us, inter alia, to integrate the development dimension into the management of post-conflict situations. Nonetheless, we note that such United Nations endeavours to assist the countries in need to extricate themselves from war and move towards lasting peace have not yet reached their full potential. That is why Senegal welcomes with great interest the report of the Advisory Group of Experts (see S/2015/490), which sheds light on the challenges as well as the measures to be taken to fill the gaps. One of the salient points of the report of the Advisory Group of Experts is that peacebuilding has been relegated to a peripheral activity. It does not enjoy sufficient financing and comes in only after the fact and in a fragmented manner. That is symptomatic of the gap between the declared ambition and the actual interest that we accord to peacebuilding. That is the reason that the delegation of Senegal calls for the development of a more voluntary, consistent and comprehensive approach, so as to break up the silos that have led to fragmentation in United Nations system's actions and efforts.

The efforts to ensure better coordination and consistency in our actions should go hand in hand with more dynamic interaction among the PBC, the main bodies of the United Nations and the funds and programmes, as well as with international, regional and local partners. It is only in that manner that we will manage to strengthen synergies and ensure that there is better impact on the ground. In that regard, my delegation would particularly like to emphasize the importance of providing greater impetus to the interaction between the Security Council and the PBC. We are of the view that the Council should allow the PBC to play its advisory role in a more extensive manner through more frequent recourse to its services, in particular in the areas of advice, awareness-raising and resource mobilization. Such a comprehensive approach should also result in the development of an integrated strategy that combines several fields, including security, sustainable development, human rights, including gender equality, and the rule of law.

To address the existing gaps in the area of peacebuilding, three fundamental aspects within the framework of the review — namely, financing, national ownership and cooperation with regional organizations — should capture our attention. While countries emerging from conflict are in need of long-term and considerable financing, we have found that such financing remains limited, unpredictable and difficult to mobilize.In order to ensure that peace is lasting, security must go hand in hand with development. Lessons drawn from the peacebuilding processes in Africa, in particular in Guinea-Bissau, give us a full idea of how important that is. Countries in the process of peacebuilding need resources to finance projects that can create wealth and jobs, in particular for young people and women, who have a key role to play in the economic and social recovery of the impacted countries.

According to the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, the Peacebuilding Fund is simply insufficient to create, by itself, the necessary impact and is far from achieving its goal of being a catalyst for the flow of more significant resources from other sources. Furthermore, my delegation supports the recommendation of the Advisory Group of Experts that the General Assembly consider adopting measures to ensure that basic financing amounting to $100 million, which symbolically represents about 1 per cent of the entire United Nations budget for peacekeeping operations, be earmarked for peacebuilding on an annual basis. It would be drawn from contributions under the Organization's regular budget.

The experience of Guinea-Bissau also demonstrates the need to rebuild confidence among various national stakeholders and make the restoration of confidence one of the national priorities in the peacebuilding process.

The principle of national ownership should guide all peacebuilding efforts, so as to ensure that there is better harmony among the offers of assistance and the goals in national peacebuilding plans, because it is up to the country concerned itself to define its priorities. The Peacebuilding Commission cannot do it for countries.

We must also attach due importance to strengthening cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission and regional organizations, in particular the African Union. Given that all of the six countries on the Commission's agenda are in Africa, it would only be logical to strengthen the partnership between the African Union and the Peacebuilding Commission, in particular with regard to development, by considering the nature and challenges of peacebuilding in Africa and by ensuring a rational sharing of the tasks and roles involved in providing support to the relevant countries and a better structured dialogue on the best way for the PBC to support the countries already receiving support from the Organization in that regard.

In conclusion, I would like to launch an appeal for better implementation of resolution 1325 (2000), which reaffirms the crucial role played by women in peacebuilding as active participants in all stages of conflict prevention, the settlement of disputes, peacebuilding and development. Women are an asset for peace and reconciliation and should be better integrated into peacebuilding processes. The success achieved in bringing women on board in the rebuilding processes in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Rwanda should guide us to mainstream and strengthen those practices in all countries. In an effort to integrate the women and peace and security agenda, and in recognition of the importance of the presence of some of the countries of West Africa on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, the countries of the region, with the support of the United Nations, adopted in 2010 the Dakar Declaration on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) in West Africa, as well as a related regional plan of action.

Mr. Pressman (United States of America): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on peacebuilding. I would also like to thank Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal for their briefings and for their important work to assist the world's most fragile countries in building sustainable peace.

This meeting is especially important in the light of the ongoing review of the United Nations peacekeeping architecture — an architecture that Member States developed over a decade ago. Three of the most crucial tenets at that time remain the core of our efforts today, namely, sustaining international attention to countries emerging from conflict, developing more effective strategies to build peace and continuing to mobilize the necessary resources to prevent a relapse into violent conflict.

The United States continues to support the goals of the peacebuilding architecture in service of the important objectives of ensuring that we not only respond to symptoms, but also address root causes; ensure that we are not only responding to war, but that we help to actually build peace; and ensure that the United Nations system is well-positioned to strategically and effectively address the needs of countries and regions, not just while civilians are under attack, but in the days, months and years after a conflict has ended.

While we continue to support those goals, we also believe that, fundamentally, the peacebuilding architecture has not lived up to its mandate or fully fulfilled the role that it was created to perform. We have diagnosed the problem many times in many different forums. Virtually every conflict-affected country considered by the Council — from Haiti to Liberia — has struggled with consolidating peace in the aftermath of conflict. We have seen the devastating human and financial consequences of deadly cycles of relapse in recent years, from the Central African Republic to South Sudan to Burundi. We know that the United Nations must do a better job of consolidating peace and preventing such relapses, but we have failed to translate our shared understanding of the problem into practical, achievable and impactful changes in how we actually do business so as address those challenges. That is why we agree with many of the assessments and support many of the recommendations of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, including the conclusion that peacebuilding remains underrecognized, underprioritized and underresourced globally within the United Nations system. With the ongoing peacebuilding architecture review in mind, I would like to lay out the vision of the United States for what a strong, coordinated and effective peacebuilding architecture should look like.

First, the primary challenge is not necessarily a lack of resources — which is too often our first port of call when efforts at the United Nations are underperforming — it is a lack of coherence. The complex nature of conflict means that United Nations entities must work in a more coordinated fashion.

Conflict prevention, conflict management and post-conflict stabilization efforts by the various parts of the United Nations system must go hand in hand if peacebuilding efforts are to succeed.

We have seen examples recently in Sri Lanka and in Sierra Leone of how an internally coherent approach can meaningfully help countries recover from conflict. With an initial commitment of $3 million from the Peacebuilding Fund, several United Nations entities, including the Department of Political Affairs, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations Development Programme and the Peacebuilding Support Office, along with the United Nations Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country team, are working together with the Government of Sri Lanka to promote effective transitional justice mechanisms that are sensitive to the different ways in which conflict has affected Sri Lankan men and women. Importantly, local Sri Lankan provincial councils are receiving capacity-building so as to help them address grievances on the part of internally displaced persons, members of minority groups and other vulnerable populations by facilitating their resettlement on land once occupied by the military.

In Sierra Leone, the integrative work of successive United Nations missions, the country team and the Sierra Leone Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configuration have been critical to breaking the cycle of violence and have provided space for Sierra Leoneans to focus on prosperity, development and democratic elections instead of war, isolation and conflict. Sierra Leone has held three peaceful and credible elections since the end of the civil war in 2002, and new institutions are rising to the challenge of being responsive to its citizens. Support from the United Nations, including the sustained engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) country-specific configuration and its admirable leadership from the Canadian Mission, has been critical to that transition.

The United States also envisions a Peacebuilding Commission that can broaden its reach across the United Nations and the broader international community. We support changes to the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific configurations so that they are smaller, more flexible, informal and better tailored groupings among Member States. The last thing we need at the United Nations is another set of meetings in which diplomats gather to express their concerns about the same problems over and over. We need ideas that translate into actions. Smaller, flexible and informal focus groupings of Member States that are willing to put diplomatic muscle and resources into advancing peace in a particular country would serve us all well.

Of course, we also urge the Peacebuilding Commission to continue to work closely with regional and multilateral organizations, including the international financial institutions, in peacebuilding efforts. The recent briefing from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank representatives to the PBC Burundi configuration exemplifies how the Peacebuilding Commission provides a really crucial link between United Nations Headquarters and the international financial institutions whose economic expertise in the field is essential to post-conflict contexts.

Our vision for the peacebuilding architecture includes a continued role for the Peacebuilding Fund, which we have long viewed as a nimble and effective rapid response tool for conflict prevention and peacebuilding support. The Peacebuilding Fund was among the first to fund a new multipartner trust fund in Colombia to respond to stabilitization and peacebuilding needs. With that initiative, the Peacebuilding Fund is serving as an effective rapid-response tool for conflict prevention and peacebuilding support. The Peacebuilding Fund, along with the United Nations special monitoring and verification mission, the United Nations country team and other multilateral donors will play a critical role helping Colombia transition into a post-accord environment. We believe that the Peacebuilding Fund's work in Colombia will help generate tangible and inclusive peace dividends to boost public confidence in the peace process and help generate the conditions necessary to implement the peace accords.

We know there are no easy solutions for societies recovering from conflict. We also know that only through coherence of effort, seriousness of purpose and more flexibility in approach can the United Nations system more fully seize all opportunities to continue to build our capacity to consolidate peace. We see the ongoing peacebuilding architecture review as a valuable opportunity to do just that.

Mr. Rycroft (United Kingdom): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate. I also want to thank Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal for their thoughtful contributions to this debate and to this agenda.

John F. Kennedy once said, "the mere absence of war is not peace". His words over half a century ago go to the heart of the issue we are discussing today, the issue of peacebuilding. Today it is no longer enough just to stop the fighting. How many issues on the Security Council's agenda are a result of countries relapsing into conflict? How many are due to leaders failing to capitalize on the absence of war, or failing to build peace and prosperity for their citizens? Today I would like to talk about Burundi, a country that sadly fits that mold.

As Security Council members saw at first-hand last month, that small, poor yet beautiful country has suffered a great deal. Just over a decade since the end of the civil war — a war that claimed 300,000 lives — it now stands on the precipice of civil war again. It is clear that the dividends of 11 years of peace have been squandered. In response, we in the Security Council have been united in our demands to President Nkurunziza to de-escalate the tensions, begin dialogue with the opposition and agree to a deployment of some form of international presence, as originally proposed by the African Union. But as we drove through Bujumbura last month, I could not help but think whether there was more that we — the Council, the United Nations, regional actors — could have done to prevent a return to violence. I hope that in the Chamber today we can all consider what more we can do in the future to prevent what we saw in Burundi from happening again elsewhere.

We have plenty to guide us — reviews of peacekeeping, of peacebuilding, of women and peace and security, all agreed last year. But if we are to avoid a failure in peacebuilding, whether in Burundi or elsewhere, people on the ground need more that just words on paper. They need meaningful action from the Council and others. I see five steps to take.

First, a key theme of those review reports is the centrality of political will at the national and the international levels to build and sustain peace. But even when the Council is united, as we have been on Burundi, our efforts can be dampened by a lack of political will by just one person — in this case President Nkurunziza. We therefore need to bring pressure to bear on those who refuse to find common ground, who will not engage in dialogue, who exhibit no trace of the political will needed to sustain peace. To do so, let us recognize that the Council is not alone in the fight. Burundi shows us the vital importance of regional organizations, such as the African Union. We need to continue and enhance that close collaboration with regional organizations, and we should draw on the support and advice of the Peacebuilding Commission too, as our briefers today advised us.

Secondly, it is clear that crisis have often been brought before the Council too late for effective preventive action. We need to improve our ability to tackle potential risks to stability before they escalate. To do so, we need to match early warning with early action. That is the best way to prevent enormous human suffering, and it is also much more cost effective than dealing with conflicts and their aftermath. Can we say honestly that we achieved that on Burundi? We visited twice in a year. Did we not we all see the warning signs? I learned from our visit that improved horizon scanning was really of no use on its own. We have to do something as a result. The Council needs to be proactive and action-oriented and to mobilize the tools at our disposal to prevent relapses into violence.

Thirdly, we need to improve our ability to sustain peace after the fighting has stopped. We must avoid the peacebuilding gap when peacekeeping missions transition out of a country and international attention falls away. Perhaps that is the greatest lesson to learn from Burundi. Sustaining engagement is challenging. The Peacebuilding Commission provides a good way to continue the political support and to draw together the United Nations system and Member States and the international financial institutions. Similarly, the Peacebuilding Fund does excellent work, and I would like to encourage all Member States to join us in making voluntary contributions to that effective tool.

Fourthly, building peace must mean building peace for all — for men, women, children, minorities, the vulnerable, for those in Government and for those in opposition. The peacebuilding review tells us that building and sustaining peace rests on a social consensus behind that peace. That is why inclusive dialogue is so important in Burundi. And so we welcome the Secretary-General's visit to Burundi today and the progress he has made on that inclusive dialogue. More broadly, as we provide practical support for development, for services and for jobs in countries emerging from conflict, let us all do so in a way that fosters inclusivity.

Fifthly, and finally, we need a whole-of-system approach that bridges the usual United Nations silos so that the system together is more than the sum of its parts. When the Security Council reaches across those divides, it is not encroachment; it is necessary joining up. I encourage other bodies too to join up across the gaps, and I point to goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals of doing that.

If we can take those five steps, we can build something really sustainable and, in doing so, ensure that the absence of war, as John F. Kennedy put it, really does lead to a more permanent peace.

Mr. Lamek (France) (*spoke in French*): I should also like to begin by thanking Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal for their respective valuable contributions to this debate.

Peacebuilding is an essential subject, and we all agree on highlighting its importance. We are also in full agreement that the United Nations needs to do more in this area. In that regard, today's open debate is a very relevant and timely topic. The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, issued in June 2015, includes a number of interesting proposals. The draft resolution on the peacebuilding architecture that is currently being debated in the General Assembly is also an opportunity to improve United Nations action in this area. For France, that improvement needs to be structured around the following points.

First of all, we must ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) fully complements and supports Security Council efforts. That is key to ensuring a fully coherent message from the United Nations on the different situations of which we are seized. For example, the Peacebuilding Commission could play an important role in maintaining political mobilization on specific situations, and thus could assist in the implementation of actions undertaken. In that regard, the Peacebuilding Commission can help mobilize the partners involved in implementing Council resolutions, such as donors, the United Nations system and the international organizations.

In addition, in some cases the Peacebuilding Commission plays a much appreciated advisory role vis-à-vis the Security Council, including through field visits by its members. The work of the Commission must be guided in that direction so that it can effectively support the Council's work. For example, we appreciate the role played by Morocco as Chair of the Central African Republic country-specific configuration and its efforts to support the financing of elections and the Special Criminal Court. Such projects are concrete and assist in the stabilization of the Central African Republic, as decided by the Security Council in coordination with transitional authorities, but their implementation requires monitoring and support that only the Central African Republic country configuration can effectively provide. Similarly, regular visits to the Great Lakes region organized by the Swiss chairmanship of the Burundi configuration are particularly useful and welcome, to the extent that they operate in the framework of excellent complementarity with initiatives taken by the Council to find a solution to the crisis in Burundi.

It is equally important to ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission organizes its work in the most effective way possible to ensure flexibility in reviewing records and also to focus in its meetings on operational and concrete issues. From that point of view, I would like to congratulate the Swedish Ambassador for his work in that area during Sweden's chairmanship of the Commission. I also congratulate the Ambassador of Kenya on his election as head of the PBC and wish him every success in his chairmanship.

Finally, with regard to financing, we welcome the activities of the Peacebuilding Fund. It is also is essential to maintain the voluntary nature of contributions to continue to ensure genuine transparency and monitoring of the commitments of the Fund. However, it must also be acknowledged that the efficacy of peacebuilding is not merely a financial issue. From that perspective, it is important to emphasize efforts to coordinate on the ground the work of the United Nations in the area of peacebuilding, as well as with international financial institutions. In that regard, the role of the Resident Coordinator must be supported and strengthened.

France is particularly committed to strengthening United Nations efforts in the area of peacebuilding. We hope that today's debate and discussions on the General Assembly draft resolution will contribute to this objective shared by all.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to thank you, Sir, for having convened today's meeting. This is a timely exchange of views that we hope will help us find a common denominator during the current talks on a draft resolution in the General Assembly and in Security Council on the reform of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

We carefully listened to the briefings by the current and outgoing Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission — the Permanent Representatives of Sweden and Kenya — as well as by Mr. Gert Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture.

Peacebuilding systems are one of the most important instruments of the United Nations for effectively resolving conflicts, stabilizing post-conflict situations and preventing new outbreaks of disastrous crises. We welcome the contribution made to the process by the report of the Advisory Group of Experts (see S/2015/490). The document offers a basis on which Member States can take informed decisions. Currently, there are ongoing discussions at the inter-State level regarding which of the constructive recommendations could be implemented in practice. The report stresses the need for peacebuilding efforts at all stages of the conflict cycle.

Without a doubt, preventing the resumption of conflict takes up much of the international agenda. Seventy years ago, the task was enshrined in Chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations, and the Organization subsequently took additional decisions on that important sphere of activity, which strengthened the basis for international efforts in that area. We think it is necessary to draw on the expertise and know-how we have garnered over time.

Furthermore, the report of the Group of Experts calls on States to look into the concept of sustaining peace, which concerns reconciliation and building a common vision of a society that only national stakeholders can undertake. The United Nations and international entities can support and facilitate the process, but not lead it. We fully agree that the primary responsibility for defining priorities and implementing strategies is borne by States themselves and that corresponding international efforts should be focused, first of all, on capacity-building in affected countries. That assistance should be provided to States upon request, in line with their action plans and based on the national sovereignty and independence of States.

We are sure that the principle of national responsibility is the linchpin in peacebuilding efforts. In current crises, which are often domestic, national Governments continue to bear the primary responsibility for their people's security. At the same time, societies themselves play a key role in creating lasting peace, as they can and must do their utmost to assist the peace process, shoulder responsibility and more fully realize their constructive potential. That is why inclusive national processes and a single vision within countries based on shared responsibility for lasting peace are of critical importance.

We recognize the productive role of women in peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts, as well as the importance of their equitable participation in that process. However, we believe that excessive focus on the gender issue is counterproductive, as there is no direct link with the root causes of conflict — and eradicating such root causes is the main task.

With regard to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) — a singular, intergovernmental advisory body — plays a key role. We support its efforts to increase the effectiveness and coordination of international assistance to countries that have requested such assistance or to those countries that are placed on its agenda by the Security Council. We believe that the PBC will continue to increase the quality of its advisory assistance to the Security Council regarding countries within the remit of both bodies. We expect that the work conducted by the Group of Experts will, in the final stage, be carried forward by Member States through specific steps to increase the Commission's effectiveness, while preserving its mandate in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Council resolution 1645 (2005).

We also note the role of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), which is an important mechanism for urgent financing that brings in long-term resources for aid in rebuilding and development. We have constantly advocated the country principle in the distribution of the PBF's funds. It is important that the work of the Fund be buoyed by relevant financial resources. Member States need to take a look at the possibility of more actively and voluntarily providing assistance. Each year, Russia provides the Fund with $2 million, with a total contribution of $12 million. It would be useful to take a closer look at all existing possibilities for raising funds, but the idea of moving the PBF to the regular budget is contradictory. That step would not only create an additional load for payers in a difficult economic context, but would also strip the Fund of its chief advantage, which is effectiveness and flexibility in chanelling funds to meet the urgent needs of States calling for assistance. On the whole, we would like to see PBC interaction with international financial institutions be bolstered.

While many initiatives developed outside the United Nations merit our attention in general, they cannot be automatically considered to be already approved and officially adopted by the Organization, and that definitely applies to the so-called New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, launched in line with the policies of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

In conclusion, would like to emphasize that the issue of adapting the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to modern realities requires a responsible, balanced and in-depth discussion. It is vital that we achieve the kind of result that will help to build peace rather than create new risks.

Mr. Rosselli (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by thanking the presidency of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for convening today's open debate and for the concept note on the subject (S/2016/104, annex). I would also like to commend Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal for their informative briefings.

Uruguay views the reform of our peacebuilding architecture as an integral part of the broader review process of the peace and security components of the United Nations, and we believe it is essential that we adapt its peace and security activities to the new challenges presented by the international scene. In that context, we support the other review efforts currently under way concerning peacekeeping operations and the women and peace and security agenda, since we believe it is crucial to ensure that they are conducted in concordance and coherently so as to optimize the use of existing resources.

Peacebuilding is a complex process, in both the medium and long terms, encompassing a very broad spectrum of tasks and actors that have to be integrated and coordinated with the Government of the country concerned in the creation of dialogue and peace processes that are inclusive and representative of society as a whole. Respect for human rights, strengthening the rule of law and creating economic development are central to the work of peacebuilding. In that regard, supporting the Government institutions that provide essential services, reintegrating those returning to their homes, creating jobs as quickly as possible, restoring basic infrastructure and various aspects of economic revitalization are all priorities without which sustained peacebuilding is impossible. My country believes that in such cases, developing national capacities should be the focus of all international efforts from the earliest stages of the process.

We should also emphasize the role of peacekeeping staff in the early stages of peacebuilding in key areas such as the provision of security and strengthening of the rule of law; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; security-sector reform and even the expansion of State authority. Such support is particularly crucial in the early stages, when a country is transitioning to the consolidation phase or when the tasks of both maintaining and building peace must be carried out simultaneously.

Uruguay agrees with the view expressed in Venezuela's concept note of the role that regional and subregional organizations, along with international financial institutions, should play in helping to create an environment conducive to lasting peace in countries emerging from conflict, and we emphasize the importance of developing strategic alliances between them and the United Nations.

Uruguay would like to stress the key role of women in building and maintaining peace, to which end we must ensure their recruitment to political leadership roles in United Nations peacebuilding programmes and strategies. In that regard, it is crucial to ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission systematically incorporates a gender perspective into all of its regulatory and promotion activities, in collaboration with UN-Women.

The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, chaired by Ambassador Rosenthal, includes highly relevant recommendations that have been discussed and analysed in the context of the negotiations being co-facilitated by the delegations of Angola and Australia. Peacebuilding should be addressed as an inherently political process that requires the active participation of the State concerned and a long-term commitment from the United Nations system. In that context, we must respect the principle of national ownership, in the belief that achieving long-term sustainable peace depends largely on forging a comprehensive partnership that includes national actors from the country in question. Peacebuilding cannot be limited to post-conflict situations as long as its goal is to prevent the emergence of conflict as well as its recurrence or continuation.

Within the peacebuilding architecture, the Commission is a fundamental tool for ensuring timely and sustained support to countries during critical stages of their development, while recognizing their specific needs and situations. The review process is an opportunity to strengthen the Commission's performance while improving its role as an adviser to the Security Council and the General Assembly. We should make use of its advisory role to the Council more often, especially in the case of States with situations on the Council's agenda and those that have been assigned country teams.

Uruguay considers the Peacebuilding Commission's lack of predictable funding a major challenge. It should be able to rely on sufficient resources, which is why Uruguay supports the recommendation of the Advisory Group that the Commission be assigned a symbolic 1 per cent of the overall budget for peacekeeping operations.

So far, I have listed the areas that we think need to be reformed if we are to make the peacebuilding architecture more effective. But in all sincerity, I have to say that it is impossible to contemplate this issue without calling attention to the irresponsibility — for that is what it is — of some of the rulers of some of the countries that are either part of the Peacebuilding Commission's programmes or the object of peacekeeping operations. Most of their time is spent playing sterile political games in their attempts to cling to power, pure and simple, rather than facing up to the immense challenges ahead of them with civic courage.

Some of us are tired. We are sick of seeing whole societies suffering from hunger, insecurity, disease and violations of their personal dignity and most basic rights when they are not being persecuted, jailed or killed, while their rulers fight to keep or seize power, and in their quest for it cancel, postpone and manipulate elections, change or attempt to change constitutions and foment grotesque nationalisms or religious or ethnic rivalries, shamelessly violating the solemn promises they have made to their peoples or the international community. The international community has given some of those countries not only effort, material goods and vast amounts of money but also, and far more important, the lives of the servants of humanitarian organizations and those deployed in peacekeeping operations. The painful question that many of us must ask is: have they died in vain?

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now make a statement in my national capacity.

We would like to express our appreciation for their excellent briefings to Ambassador Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; Ambassador Olof Skoog, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission; and Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture. We also thank Ambassador De Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil, for his invaluable support during his time as Chair of the Commission. We would like to thank everyone for their participation in today's open debate on peacebuilding, which is being held concurrently with a major intergovernmental negotiation process in the General Assembly, facilitated by Ambassadors Gillian Bird and Gaspar Martins, the Permanent Representatives of Australia and Angola.

Peacebuilding involves a range of long-term political, institutional and development activities that seek to address the root causes of conflicts, prevent them from recurring and achieve sustainable and lasting peace. The visionary 1992 report of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) laid the foundation for the United Nations system to establish what came to be known as the peacebuilding architecture, made up of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office. Last year, on occasion of the tenth anniversary of the establishment of that architecture, the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture examined the activities of that architecture over recent years. The conclusions of the report prompt us to reflect deeply on how the United Nations addresses peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding processes are non-linear and are much more lengthy and costly than anticipated in 2005, when the peacebuilding architecture was established. We are talking about structural changes that could take up to a generation to bear fruit. That requires the Organization to update and adapt its projections and its models to achieve lasting peace in countries in post-conflict situations. We must leave behind templates that call for mechanical and unnecessarily rigid and overly accelerated peacebuilding processes.

Mediation processes, peace agreements, the drafting of constitutions and the holding of elections need to be much more representative and inclusive of local aspects, as well as more cognizant of the political context of the countries in question.

In addition, peacebuilding processes must be accompanied by the ongoing political presence and attention of the United Nations. Although capacity- and institution-building in countries in post-conflict situations indeed require technical expertise, peacebuilding is first and foremost an inherently political process. As some case studies have revealed, once peacekeeping operations or special political missions withdraw from the field, we see a substantive political divestment on the part of the United Nations system. That approach cannot continue. In order to be effective and durable, peacebuilding processes require sustained funding and political attention for prolonged periods. That reality ought to be a priority for the States Members of the Organization, which should take the necessary steps to address it.

The United Nations currently devotes little political attention and few resources to peacebuilding. That is directly related to the budgetary allocation of resources and represents one of the causes of the relapses into conflict in many countries. The United Nations tends to be reactive when addressing conflicts, favouring the use of short-term security and humanitarian measures to the detriment of long-term actions that could address the root causes of conflict. That is clearly reflected in the distribution of resources: while the budget for humanitarian assistance has reached $21.5 billion and the budget for peacekeeping operations is $8 billion, the budget of the Peacebuilding Fund is a mere $100 million per year, to distributed among 22 countries.

On the topic of peacebuilding, the Security Council has a great deal to do with regard to the manner in which it deals with conflicts. It seems the Security Council has a predilection for implementing Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, instead of Chapters devoted to the prevention of conflict, which further exacerbates the situation in post-conflict countries. Few cases illustrate that pattern as clearly as does the case of Libya. Following the adoption of resolution 1973 (2011) and the establishment a no-fly zone, an international military coalition authorized by the Security Council spent billions of dollars to overthrow the Libyan Government. After the military intervention in Libya, as had occurred earlier in Iraq, the country entered into a prolonged, ongoing state of political instability — without institutions, without infrastructure, without public services, without security, without means of survival and without a stable economy — but with the most sophisticated weapons on the market, the presence of non-State armed groups, the division of the country and the ensuing political and economic instability. The need for peacebuilding in those brotherly Arab countries is one of the main challenges and responsibilities of the United Nations, and in particular of the Security Council.

The crisis of migrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea from North Africa — who risk their lives and those of their children — is a harrowing indicator of the need to strengthen the peacebuilding architecture. The majority of those migrants come from African countries that have emerged from conflict but are unable to build peace, re-establish the minimal conditions necessary for a decent life for people or to rebuild their societies or their economies.

Peacebuilding will be possible only to the extent that the root causes of conflict are addressed; otherwise, we will face increasing and recurring conflicts rooted primarily in the weakness of State institutions in post-conflict countries. We should place greater emphasis on reactivating sustainable socioeconomic development in countries in post-conflict situations. We cannot expect to build peace if at the same time we ignore the need of the people to meet their most basic socioeconomic needs, secure the means to earn a living and provide the basis for inclusive development with social justice. Therefore, giving people the means to join the economy and integrate into society and creating the foundation for inclusive, sustainable and equitable growth should be part of any peacebuilding process. However, little or no attention at all is directed towards meeting those needs. There is not even clarity in studies or in institutional practice on how to re-energize the economies and institutions of countries emerging from conflict. For Venezuela, that is one of the central issues of peacebuilding, which should be given the requisite attention.

On the other hand, the recovery of countries emerging from conflicts must not include coercive measures on the part of international institutions that place onerous and unfair conditions on those countries, particularly if those measures violate the country's sovereignty. There is a need for more resources to the socioeconomic development of countries emerging from conflict that include differentiated and beneficial conditions. Preferential and differentiated conditions should be established in the international financial system in order to provide direct support to countries that have brought war to an end and do not want to go back to the path of conflict. In particular, we have been very concerned that countries emerging from conflict should have the necessary capacities to manage their own economies and natural resources — a necessity for all our countries.

As Latin Americans, we find two cases to be emblematic cases, namely, those of Haiti and Colombia. The case of Haiti serves to illustrate the need to maintain both respect for a country's sovereignty and ongoing support to help it overcome terrible economic conditions left after so many years of conflict. And the case of Colombia gives us hope that the international community will help the Colombian people to navigate peace and create the necessary social and economic conditions so that such a heartbreaking conflict never again reoccurs.

I would like once again to acknowledge the vision of the late former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, whom we pay tribute to. We sincerely hope that today's open debate will lead us to think further about how the international community and the United Nations can address peacebuilding and contribute to the consultation and negotiation processes to take place in other United Nations organs.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

I would like to remind all speakers to limit their statements to a maximum of four minutes, so that the Council can carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to distribute their texts in writing and deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber. I would also like to appeal to speakers to deliver their statements at a reasonable speed, so that the interpreters can perform their job as precisely as possible. I wish to inform all concerned that we will be continuing this open debate right through the lunch hour, as we have a very large number of speakers.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Igor Lukšić, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Montenegro.

Mr. Lukšić (Montenegro): Montenegro is pleased is pleased to contribute to this important open debate and commends Venezuela's strong commitment to the issue before us. We thank the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture for its valuable review report (see S/2015/490), as well as today's briefers for their valuable presentations, which have reminded us of the relevance of this agenda item to the Security Council.

Montenegro aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union. However, I would like to make some additional remarks in my national capacity.

The challenges that we face today are real and serious. The effects of the evolving nature of modern conflicts and the more complex security landscape will be felt for years to come, but the landmark achievements of the past year, especially those marked by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), offer hope and an opportunity to make substantial changes for the common good. The three reviews initiated under the peace and security pillar are also critical to our work within those valuable guidelines and to efforts to improve our response to the changing global security environment. The time has come, therefore, for challenges to be addressed more decisively by a strengthened and more effective United Nations, as the vision of our founding fathers has not yet been fully carried out. Allow me to concentrate on several issues.

I find the Advisory Group of Experts' report particularly relevant to our discussion today and as well as to our future activities with regard to peacebuilding. It is striking that, after all of our accumulated experience and institutional memory, we have stated today that peace is underrecognized, underprioritized and underresourced, not only globally but also within the United Nations. That especially concerns the prevention of conflicts, and that is why I would like to underline the significance of the United Nations early detection and early warning mechanisms. The Security Council must consider how to make better use of the options at its disposal for preventing the emergence of conflicts. We believe that a shift from the perception of failures to act to a culture of prevention or early action continues to be essential and require political will and leadership on the part of all actors. Montenegro highly values the Human Rights Up Front initiative and strongly supports efforts to make it a greater priority. Mediation must also receive greater attention and resources, because it represents such a cost-effective tool.

Another aspect to consider is the establishment of closer and more frequent dialogues between the Security Council and the Geneva-based human rights architecture, especially with special procedures mandate holders and with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Their capacities and recommendations can prove to be valuable in directing attention to the human rights violations and risk factors that could cause the escalation of crises. As a member State of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Montenegro believes that the Commission's potential could be better exploited by keeping in mind its unique role. We also believe that it is necessary to further improve the complementarity of the work carried out by the PBC and the Security Council, in order to maximize their joint impact in preventing conflict and in sustaining peace. The cooperation partnership between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in the area of peacebuilding should also be strengthened, based on each party's comparative advantage, with a view to enhancing their global impact. They possess valuable assets, such as knowledge and understanding of the crisis; but, of equal importance, they ensure the involvement of the countries that are directly affected.

It is a fact that development is considered to be the best resilience-builder of all. That is why achieving sustainable development is seen as an essential conflict-prevention tool. Addressing human rights violations as early as possible and ensuring respect for human rights are also crucial to peacebuilding. That brings us to the very pertinent, yet challenging, issue of the interconnectedness and reinforcement of the three pillars of the United Nations. There is an obvious need for a more comprehensive and integrated approach to peacebuilding through peace and security development and human rights engagement within the prescribed mandates. We must work towards enhancing partnerships among the main United Nations bodies in order to avoid fragmentation and build coherence in collective efforts at intergovernmental and operational levels. Without that kind of approach, our progress will be limited in its results and effects. However, the maintenance of international peace and security is not only a task to be carried out by the United Nations and other international organizations. It is a process of individual, collective and institutional transformation, a process of inclusive development based on the universal values of the respect for life, justice, solidarity, human rights and equality between women and men.

We should keep in mind that the risk of extremism, terrorism, organized crime and conflict increases where people have no education and no hope for the future, and where there is exclusion and a lack of development. It drives migration from countries emerging from conflict, experiencing fragile peace and institution-building, and where reform is of crucial importance. The promotion of efforts to sustain peace must be broadly shared and involve all groups of society, particularly women and youth. We should recognize women as vital assets for societies, and not simply as victims. The potential of youth should also be utilized and not undermined, as is often the case. We believe that it is crucial to involve women and youth in the peacebuilding process as stakeholders and decision-makers. That enables them to acquire ownership of the policies that affect them and all of us.

Montenegro will continue to play its part in efforts to contribute to a more effective peacebuilding architecture and ensure a comprehensive approach to peacebuilding.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Hungary.

Ms. Bogyay (Hungary): Hungary supports all efforts aimed at making peacebuilding more effective and recognizes the need to apply a holistic and integrated approach to sustaining peace. I wish to thank Venezuela for having convened this very timely open debate.

While we fully support the statement to be delivered later on behalf of the European Union, please allow me to add several observations in my national capacity.

First, we believe that much stronger emphasis should be placed on conflict prevention through early engagement and by using all available tools for early warning and political mediation in order to prevent the outbreak or escalation of conflicts. We fully believe that peacebuilding must be understood as an inherently political process that requires strengthening the synergy among the related efforts of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, recovery and development. Hungary also particularly welcomes the call for strengthening the role of global and regional partnerships aimed at peacebuilding, with a special focus on prevention and mediation. We believe that there is a need to further strengthen the formal and informal mechanisms of engagement at the strategic level, including, if possible, through the adoption by the Security Council of a clearer methodology for consulting with its counterparts at the regional and subregional levels. We are of the view that the great potential for effective partnerships between the United Nations and international financial institutions should be fully utilized. In addition, we consider the engagement of civil society, religious leaders, local communities and women and youth groups as also being essential in assisting the realization of sustained peace.

The Hungarian Government is of the view that, in order to be successful in preventing conflicts or rebuilding conflict-torn countries, we must tackle the root causes. Hungary, as co-Chair of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, worked with Member States to ensure that Goal 16 explicitly recognized the linkage between peace, inclusion, sustainable development, justice and accountability.

The importance of women's participation in peacebuilding cannot be overemphasized. Women are crucial partners in the transition from war to peace. They are key agents for promoting social cohesion, political legitimacy and economic recovery. That is especially relevant in places where peace has broken down and conflict has shifted the focus away from cooperation towards division and hatred. We hope that the outcome of the peacebuilding review process will adequately recognize that fact.

In that context, I would also like to stress that education in general — in particular that of women, youth and marginalized groups — also has an important role to play, both in preventing conflicts and in post-conflict peacebuilding. We deem the realization of the right to education to be the cornerstone of lasting peace, since ignorance, misunderstanding, the erosion of culture and the loss of cultural identity are often the starting points for fanaticism and conflicts.

Let me conclude my statement by emphasizing that ensuring accountability for serious international crimes — given its proven deterrent effect — should be a key component of peacebuilding efforts. Bringing perpetrators to justice helps to heal the wounds of societies torn apart by such crimes.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the observer of the African Union.

Mrs. Bailey: Like other speakers before me, let me start by commending you, Mr. President, for organizing this important Security Council open debate on the theme "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture". I would also like to thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Kamau; the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Skoog; as well as Ambassador De Aguiar Patriota and Ambassador Rosenthal, for their respective briefings.

Today's open debate is very timely, as we are reaching the final stages of the review process of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. The African Union (AU) attaches importance to that process, which represents, in our view, an excellent opportunity not only to improve the orientation and functioning of the institutional components of the peacebuilding architecture, but also to strengthen its effectiveness in helping the countries concerned to lay the foundation for durable peace and development.

As everyone is aware, Africa has been the major regional focus of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture over the past decade. All of the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission are from Africa. African countries have received approximately 80 per cent of the Peacebuilding Fund's allocations over the period 2007 to 2014. Therefore, the experience of the African countries on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda offers a vital source of lessons learned that could benefit the ongoing review process.

Despite the general improvement in the conflict situations on the continent, recent experiences have clearly shown that the risk of relapse into conflict remains very high and that the peacebuilding gains are still very fragile, in particular during the early stages of a transition, as demonstrated by the Ebola crisis in West Africa. It is important, therefore, to identify policies and programmes that allow three initiatives to be undertaken: first, addressing the root causes of conflicts; secondly, speeding up reconstruction activities; and, thirdly, consolidating peace, thereby preventing a return to violence.

Throughout that process, international support will amount to little if no corresponding effort exists to mobilize adequate resources for the implementation of the priorities defined. Needless to say, the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict are enormous. They often include the need to transform warweakened economies and highly polarized political and social relations, as well as the need to strengthen the State apparatus so that Governments can fulfil the roles critical to social and economic well-being. No significant progress can be made without adequate financial resources and technical assistance to assist the countries concerned in facing those challenges.

Over the past decade, the African Union has increasingly affirmed its readiness and capacity to engage in peacebuilding activities based on the African Union post-conflict reconstruction and development policy, adopted in 2006, as well as on the relevant provisions of the protocol relating to the establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union. As part of the implementation of the policy, the AU Commission has undertaken a number of measures. They include the identification of experts to be included in an African experts database on peacebuilding, the development of guidelines for the implementation of specific activities related to the policy and the organization of assessment missions to countries emerging from conflict. The AU has also raised funds to support quick-impact projects in countries emerging from conflict, including Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire, the Comoros and South Sudan, so as to lay the foundation for long-term sustainable development. In addition, in 2012, the AU launched the African Solidarity Initiative, which is aimed at mobilizing a higher level of support, particularly from Africa, for post-conflict reconstruction and development efforts. The initiative was designed to encourage, motivate and empower African countries to begin systematically offering assistance to post-conflict countries.

In that context, the AU Peace and Security Council made the following suggestions to the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for advancing the partnership between the two institutions, based on the principles of complementarity, comparative advantage and collaboration:

First, the PBC and the AU should cooperate to develop a common assessment of the nature and scope of the peacebuilding challenges facing the countries concerned. They should also agree on a division of tasks, with each institution responsible for providing support in the peacebuilding sphere.

Secondly, the PBC and the AU should develop a more frequent and structured dialogue. In that regard, the first engagement between the PBC and the African Union's Peace and Security Council, in 2014, should be followed up and become institutionalized so as to gain greater coherence on strategic priorities between the PBC and the PSC.

Thirdly, the high-level exchanges between the AU and the PBC need to be underpinned by a desk-to-desk exchange between the Peacebuilding Support Office, the relevant departments of the AU Commission and the relevant parts of regional mechanisms.

Fourthly, the PBC should encourage AU efforts, including by supporting the African Solidarity Initiative in developing its database of support from African countries to other countries emerging from conflict.

In conclusion, the AU hopes that the ongoing United Nations review will provide concrete results that will improve the implementation of the noble agenda of peacebuilding. For its part, the AU remains committed to assuming its responsibilities in that regard in full cooperation with the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan): I thank today's briefers and commend the presidency of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for convening this open debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture at a time when we are at a crossroads, confronted by protracted conflicts, violent extremism, cyberinsecurity and destabilized societies — problems that are in turn aggravated by climate change, cross-border economic shocks, transnational crime and massive population flows. We therefore need to assess the performance and impact of the peacebuilding architecture thus far in preventing conflicts and providing human security.

My delegation supports the recommendations contained in the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture aimed at the full realization of the peacebuilding architecture's functions, resources and modes of engagement, as well as its links with the United Nations system.

First, peacebuilding needs to be associated primarily with the post-conflict phase, but it must also be integrated from the very start in all United Nations efforts involving conflict-prevention and -resolution mechanisms.

Secondly, the original design and interventions should be more comprehensive and long-term so as to suit contemporary and future environments, as well as be able to adapt to the changing nature of conflicts. Therefore, the Security Council must work closely with the Peacebuilding Commission to ensure the proper financing and use of the resources of the Peacebuilding Fund and field support offices.

Thirdly, it is critical that the United Nations system achieve greater internal coherence among its agencies and country teams on the ground, as well as with host countries and regional structures and organizations. National ownership, the mobilization of civil society and close cooperation with Special Representatives, special missions and peacekeeping operations are also crucial to a successful peacebuilding architecture.

The peacebuilding architecture should fully incorporate the goals and principles of the Human Rights Council and the responsibility to protect, inter alia, by adopting tailor-made strategies. No two conflict situations are the same, as each one is tied to multiple different domestic and international actors with varied agendas. Hence, the peacebuilding architecture requires multisectoral and interdisciplinary strategies aimed at national and local ownership, capacity-building, inclusive institution-building, mutual accountability and risk management, as well as at building resilience. That involves the intersection of security and development, with distinct pillars, including reforms in public safety, the rule of law, good governance, justice, human rights, reconciliation and ending impunity. In addition, other key priorities include socioeconomic reconstruction and psychosocial rehabilitation.

In order to ensure peace and security, my country, Kazakhstan, is undertaking multidimensional measures at the national, regional and international levels in the fields of preventive diplomacy, economic and social development and inter-ethnic and interreligious dialogue. We have adopted our National Strategy 2050, which provides the conditions needed for the ongoing equitable and inclusive political and economic development of the country in order to lay the groundwork for social stability.

We are strengthening inter-ethnic and interreligious unity by fostering dialogue and cooperation among the 130 nationalities residing in the country through the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan and the triennial Congress of the Leaders of World and Traditional Religions. We strongly believe that religion, morality, ethics and tolerance foster peace and stability, and we have therefore initiated a high-level forum on religions for peace, to be held in May in New York, under the patronage of the President of the General Assembly.

Last year President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan proposed the elaboration of a global development strategy to eliminate conflicts for all time, and the allocation of 1 per cent of national military expenditures to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Fund.

In addition, Kazakhstan provides humanitarian and development assistance to the most vulnerable countries. I hope that the ongoing joint initiatives between my Government and the United Nations Development Programme in Africa and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific in the Pacific region on behalf of the small island developing States and our work with the Caribbean Community demonstrate our continuing commitment to peace, security, stability and prosperity.

We are determined to share in the efforts of the global community to build a more environmentally friendly world, with a particular focus on water, energy and nuclear security, which are the pillars of my country's campaign for election to a non-permanent seat in the Security Council for the term 2017-2018. We are strongly committed to contributing to the extent possible to the Council's peacebuilding mandate.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Hallergard: I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and its member States. The candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

I would like to thank the Venezuelan presidency of the Security Council for organizing this timely open debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture and for providing the Council and the United Nations as a whole with this opportunity to reflect on ways to improve and strengthen the performance and impact of the peacebuilding architecture. Allow me also to thank Ambassador Kamau, Ambassador Skoog and Ambassador Rosenthal for their valuable briefings.

The European Union reiterates the great importance it attaches to an ambitious outcome of the review and will continue to be actively engaged in the process. We fully subscribe to the conclusions of the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture that a change in mindset is needed. Peacebuilding is no longer to be seen as a post-conflict activity, as the challenge of sustaining peace covers the complete cycle of our engagement. Given the recurrent nature of violent conflict, sustaining peace equals conflict prevention in many cases.

Once again, we would like to underscore the utmost importance of linking the peacebuilding review to the Secretary-General's review of peace operations, the review of resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security, and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on financing for sustainable development. Linking the recommendations of those crucial reviews and processes should help to ensure maximum coherence in United Nations actions. In that regard, we welcome the high-level thematic debate to be held by the President of the General Assembly in May, as well as the invitation on the part of the Economic and Social Council to pursue its cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), which should take into account the follow-up and review processes for the 2030 Agenda, including the role of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

Peacebuilding was conceived in order to address the gap between security and development in fragile post-conflict countries. A basic premise is that peacebuilding should be carried out at the country level and always adjusted to the specific country context. To be truly effective in its response in fragile States, the United Nations system needs to work in a more integrated, flexible and coordinated fashion, at both the country and the Headquarters levels, and give more weight to prevention and early-warning tools. There are already good examples of strengthened cooperation between United Nations entities in the field of peacebuilding and conflict prevention, in particular through the joint United Nations Development Programme/Department of Political Affairs programme on building national capacities for conflict prevention. Lessons and experiences from that programme could offer an opportunity for useful reflection on a more integrated and flexible United Nations approach to peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is an inherently political process that should be carried out on the basis of a long-term vision and a holistic approach. It should address the structural causes of conflict as well as the contemporary risks of recurrence, provide for inclusive and participatory political processes, build strong and effective institutions capable of addressing the root causes of conflict and be responsive to people's needs. It should promote inclusive national ownership on the part of the Government, the opposition and civil society, using a bottom-up approach.

Special attention should be paid to vulnerable or excluded groups, including ethnic or religious minorities, political opposition groups, youth and other segments of society that are at particular risk. The role of women in peace consolidation should be given particular attention, in terms of both participation and representation, taking into account the principles outlined in the 2030 Agenda and resolution 1325 (2000). That is important, both in its own right and because we know that by doing so we increase the chances of sustaining peace. The human rights dimension should, in general, be integrated into peacebuilding, both as an overall objective and as an important early-warning tool.

In addition, the analytical capacities of the Peacebuilding Commission should be strengthened in order to better monitor ongoing activities and assess the impact of the international efforts on the ground. The cooperation of the PBC with the authorities of the host State is important with the aim of promoting national ownership of the peacebuilding efforts and the transfer of responsibilities from United Nations actors to national authorities.

The PBC's greatest comparative advantage is its convening power: the ability to call to task a large number of Member States, regional and subregional organizations and help reconcile their approaches. But its ability to deliver this political added value is hampered by a number of factors. Some country-specific configurations of the PBC have taken a more flexible and politically attuned approach, and lessons should be learned from these experiences. Different, especially lighter, modes of engagement for the PBC should be envisaged.

With regard to securing more predictable financing for peacebuilding, the EU believes it is important to address the silo approach of the donor community. The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has achieved significant results, but the PBF is a small-scale strategic fund that has to be followed and complemented by longer-term commitments from other financing sources, which may be bilateral or multilateral, including multilateral and regional development banks. For its part, the EU has already engaged in joint funding for peacebuilding projects via our Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace, and further opportunities for joint funding should be explored.

The EU is keen to work in increasing partnership with the United Nations, including on the ground. The EU and the United Nations are as development actors collaborating closely in the field and are also engaged in a dialogue on conflict prevention that should be built on to further identify comparative advantages and opportunities for partnership. This includes raising the importance of prevention and early warning on the political agenda, including through international networks such as the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State-building.

In addition, the EU and the United Nations have built a strong and continuously evolving partnership in crisis management. EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions, such as the European Union military mission to contribute to the training of the Malian Armed Forces, the European Union Capacity Building Mission in Mali and the European Union CSDP Military Advisory Mission in the Central African Republic, focusing on security-sector reform and capacity-building, contribute to peacebuilding processes in a complementary way to United Nations peace operations.

More generally, in the context of its comprehensive approach to external conflict and crises, which aims to enhance the coherence, effectiveness and impact of the EU's policy and action, the European Union seeks to develop close coordination with the relevant United Nations entities on the ground. This is in particular the case already for peacebuilding or State-building projects such as support for accountability mechanisms, the criminal justice chain and community policing. A shared conflict analysis is a good starting point for such cooperation.

Close strategic and operational partnerships between the United Nations and international, regional and subregional organizations and international financial institutions are also required in order to address the challenge of sustaining peace. The EU believes that this should be part of an ongoing dialogue between the United and those organizations and go beyond holding annual dialogues or high-level working meetings.

We look forward to the review producing bold, concrete and focused outcomes to improve the architecture so as to ensure effective, well-coordinated and complementary peacebuilding efforts throughout the United Nations system.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Colombia.

Ms. Mejía Vélez (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this open debate on a subject that is vital to current discussions in our Organization. I should like also to thank Ambassadors Rosenthal, Kamau and Skoog for their very valuable contributions to today's debate.

The year 2015 was key to refocusing the actions of the United Nations in the areas of peacebuilding and peacekeeping, through the review of the peacebuilding architecture, the work of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security (S/2015/716), all of which constitute key tools in refocusing the strategies of the United Nations for action on and support for the process of reform that we have undertaken.

I should like to highlight three actions in that context.

First, there is a need to expand the scope of the concept of peacebuilding to include sustainable peace, as Ambassador Rosenthal said, on the understanding that each case is different, because not all processes are equal, and the United Nations must tailor its actions to the particular requirements of each situation.

The strategy of reacting to crises in an international situation that is increasingly complex is neither sufficient nor sustainable for the United Nations; peacebuilding must be a focus before, during and following conflicts.

Secondly, preventive action accompanied by inclusive national ownership is the best alternative for countries that find themselves on the verge of conflicts and that decide to seek the support of United Nations. This helps to prevent the human and economic toll of a confrontation. In that respect, we would reiterate the importance of institutionalizing women's participation in peace and reconciliation processes.

Thirdly, we need to promote coherence in terms of peacebuilding strategies and resources throughout the United Nations system and its principal organs, including the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Ambassador Rosenthal has called for action to break down silos so as to strengthen support for and the advisory role played by the Peacebuilding Commission, with the assistance of the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund.

Ensuring that there is an impact on the ground, as has been described very clearly by some speakers here, and responding to expectations and mandates will be possible only if we have sufficient, predictable and sustainable resources for peacebuilding on the very long road travelled by countries emerging from conflict. We must adjust our priorities if we truly wish to achieve sustainable peace and deepen our associations with various actors, including the international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, which must play a more relevant role in peacebuilding. That is what we are doing today in the context of our own regional organization, the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, in the peace process in Colombia, for which the Security Council fittingly expressed its support.

Colombia is convinced that in order to enhance the impact of the Organization's peacebuilding efforts, peacebuilding must go hand in hand with the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). The universal, indivisible and comprehensive nature of the Agenda is a reflection of the fact that there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development.

We nations that know full well the difficulties involved in achieving peace are well aware that the road is not easy, but we are convinced that we will be able to reach our goal. My country, Colombia, has undertaken a number of innovative, sometimes risky, political processes and actions, in a sort of collective endeavour aimed at achieving a sustainable peace after some 50 years of conflict. It is Colombia's hope that it will be one of the many success stories in the context of achieving peace and that the lessons that we have learned will make a contribution to those that, like us, are on the path towards peacebuilding.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mr. De Aguiar Patriota (Brazil) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to congratulate the Mission of Venezuela for having brought to the attention of the Security Council an issue that is very important to Brazil.

(*spoke in English*)

Let me thank the current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Kamau of Kenya, as well as Ambassador Olof Skoog of Sweden and Ambassador Gert Rosenthal of Guatemala for setting the right tone for this debate today.

This open debate is timely, as it takes place at the intergovernmental stage of the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We have before us a unique opportunity to provide the appropriate normative framework and resources for the United Nations to fulfil its core objective of sustaining peace. Because of its universal membership, the General Assembly should play a leading role in this debate.

As rightly underscored in the concept note (S/2016/104, annex) circulated for this meeting, the notion of peacebuilding has evolved since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolutions 1645 (2005) and 1646 (2005). In that regard, I would like to acknowledge the valuable work undertaken by the Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, which sheds light on the fundamental debate regarding how to strengthen the United Nations approach to sustaining peace.

The Advisory Group's report (see S/2015/490) underscores that the peacebuilding architecture cannot be understood as exclusively limited to the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office. With regard to the concept of sustaining peace, the report stresses the importance of a broader and more integrated approach to peacebuilding, which would require the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to work in partnership, each within the particular purview and scope conferred on it by the Charter of the United Nations. With respect to the four areas suggested for debate in the concept note, we would like to highlight the following issues.

Brazil is convinced that the lack of adequate and predictable financing is a fundamental challenge to long-term peacebuilding efforts. It is therefore critical that we agree on the need to strengthen the Peacebuilding Fund by directing resources to it from assessed contributions. It is also important to enable peacekeeping missions to utilize resources from their budgets to finance programmatic activities.

We also concur that sustaining peace requires long-term engagement on the part of the United Nations system. A comprehensive approach to sustaining peace should address the need for eradicating poverty, promoting socioeconomic development and gender equality, building full-fledged institutions, promoting national reconciliation, improving governance and developing more inclusive societies. Those strategies for peacebuilding should be implemented in close coordination with national authorities, while taking into account the priorities established and the need for national ownership at all stages.

Another aspect to be emphasized is the importance of development in peacebuilding. The United Nations experience in conflict situations has demonstrated that sustainable peace requires a comprehensive approach to security, which involves considering the root causes of conflict and the social and economic situation on the ground.

Following the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), we now have a multilateral framework for promoting sustainable development. We should bear in mind that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are of a universal nature. In that sense, Goal 16, which speaks of promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development and of providing access to justice for all and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels, is aimed at all Member States. An interpretation according to which Goal 16 is directed only at conflict and post-conflict situations would disregard the universality of the SDGs and could indirectly lead to the mistaken assumption that violence and instability exist mainly in poor or less developed regions.

Brazil is of the view that the Peacebuilding Commission has a unique role to play in its advisory capacity to the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, and is well positioned to serve as an integrative forum for discussing the development-related aspects of sustaining peace. It should also be stressed that sustaining peace is a task that encompasses the three pillars of the United Nations, which are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. We commend the fact that the current Chair of the PBC and former Chair of the Open Working Group on the SDGs, Ambassador Macharia Kamau, is already bringing his considerable expertise amassed in the area of sustainable development to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

On the role of regional and subregional organizations in peacebuilding, Brazil supports enhancing cooperation in that area and building on the example of regional arrangements made for peacekeeping under Chapter VIII of the Charter. Regional and subregional partners are usually well placed to have a better understanding of the situation on the ground and could positively influence it. However, a case-by-case analysis of the convenience of such arrangements should always be conducted.

Finally, I would like to stress the importance of the other two review processes launched by the Secretary-General, namely, that on United Nations peacekeeping and that on women and peace and security, and the need to ensure coherence among their outcomes. It is noteworthy that the three reports on those processes propose to advance the primacy of politics and conflict prevention. Brazil fully supports those goals, which we believe should constitute the basis for revamping the peace and security pillar of the Organization.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Ms. Bird (Australia): As we meet today in the Security Council, we all know — all too well — how fleeting peace can be. As the Secretary-General has reminded us time and again, countries that experience armed conflict often remain at risk of relapsing into violence for years after the conflict has ended. Some 90 per cent of conflicts between 2000 and 2009 occurred in countries that had previously experienced civil war.

We meet with the benefit of the insights provided by three seminal reports concluded in 2015 — that of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (see S/2015/490), the review of United Nations peace operations (see S/2015/446), and the Global Study on the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) (S/2015/716). Like others, I welcome the participation of Ambassador Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts, in today's debate. Together, those reports lay out a clear framework for how the United Nations can better work to achieve the goal of the Charter of the United Nations of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Central to that vision is the need to achieve sustainable peace, which is not a nebulous concept. Rather, it clarifies the fact that in order to achieve just, meaningful and lasting peace we must prioritize peacebuilding across the complete cycle of United Nations engagement, from conflict prevention and resolution through to reconciliation and recovery.

Sustainable peace requires us to take a longer-term perspective in our efforts to maintain international peace and security. It requires intergovernmental and operational coherence among the principal United Nations organs and United Nations agencies and between Headquarters and the field. That needs to be supported by integrated analysis, planning, policy development and implementation.

Sustaining peace requires drawing together the United Nations political, peace and security, human rights, development and humanitarian arms, and demands a whole-of-the-United Nations approach. Fundamentally, it recognizes that to be sustainable, peace must be nationally owned and inclusive of all, particularly women, youth and civil society. And it acknowledges that the scale of the challenge requires close strategic and operational partnerships between the United Nations and other key stakeholders, including regional and subregional organizations, multilateral financial institutions and the private sector.

As co-Chair of the intergovernmental phase of the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, along with the Ambassador of Angola, Australia was given the task of translating the widely supported vision for United Nations peacebuilding set out in the Advisory Group of Experts report into parallel draft resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Our consultations are ongoing. We have been pleased by the constructive spirit in which they are being held and the strong demand that we are hearing from Member States for a more comprehensive approach to United Nations peacebuilding. That includes broad acknowledgement that adequate, predictable and sustained financing is essential to support United Nations system-wide peacebuilding efforts.

I would like to conclude by stating that today's debate is not about the scale or nature of the crises facing the world, or whether the human cost of those crises is too high. Those aspects are a given. The question is how we seize the opportunity before us to change how we conceive of and do peacebuilding and how we ensure that our most vulnerable people — those in conflict-affected countries — are not left behind in our implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1).

Sustaining peace represents a crucial change in mindset with regard to how the United Nations does peacebuilding. It is not a new concept. Rather, it goes to the very heart of the goals of the Charter. Australia is committed to working closely with all Member States to find consensus in that effort.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Italy.

Mr. Cardi (Italy): I wish to thank the President and his delegation for convening this open debate, which gives us an opportunity to discuss the review of the peacebuilding architecture and United Nations efforts to sustain peace.

Italy aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union and wishes to add the following remarks in its national capacity.

The year 2016 is one of opportunities to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to deliver as one. It is our responsibility to improve the peacebuilding efforts of the whole United Nations system — first and foremost by ensuring coherent action on the part of all the relevant stakeholders. In that perspective, it is of the utmost importance to take an integrated approach to the three major reviews under way — the future of peacekeeping, the role of women in peace and security, and the architecture of peacebuilding. In that connection, I would like to thank Ambassador Rosenthal for the very important report (see S/2015/490) produced by the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacekeeping Architecture.

As a member of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Italy is confident that, under the leadership of the new Chair, Ambassador Macharia Kamau of Kenya, the former Chair from

Sweden and the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, this will be another year of significant achievements. In addition, the ambitious outcome of the review, which we expect to see reflected in the draft resolution on the subject to be prepared by the end of March, will pave the way for a strengthened PBC.

There is growing awareness of the importance of the PBC's bridging role through its preventive and multidimensional approach to conflict in the face of rapidly changing security challenges. Massive migration flows, climate change and human rights violations are notable examples of crisis drivers, and their growing impact on international peace and security deserves our attention. In that framework, Italy believes that the ongoing review of the peacebuilding architecture, under the leadership of Australia and Angola, should reshape the PBC to make it a more complete tool, thereby enhancing the overall capacity of the United Nations in the field of preventive diplomacy. Peacebuilding must happen before a conflict erupts. The PBC can play an important role in bringing together all the relevant stakeholders, both inside and outside the United Nations. We therefore support a closer relationship between the Security Council and the PBC, which we consider a valuable tool available to the Council to enhance its capacity at preventive diplomacy. As a first practical measure, we believe that closer cooperation between the Security Council and the PBC could be ensured by inviting the Chairs of the country-specific configurations to participate in Council meetings, as appropriate.

However, the United Nations should not be seen as the sole peacebuilding actor, but rather as the main global enabler of partnerships to sustain peace. It can and must ensure greater cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, multilateral institutions and non-governmental organizations, among which there are many active in the field of preventive diplomacy. The United Nations development system has a fundamental role to play in that regard, as its work on the field is based on a fruitful collaboration with all actors.

While virtually all Member States acknowledge the importance of long-term solutions to conflict, resources and the necessary political attention to peacebuilding are sorely lacking. There is widespread agreement on the need to secure more predictable funding. In that connection, as recently announced, Italy has decided to resume its contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund throughout 2016, and is committed to ensuring more predictable funds for peacebuilding as a whole. But we also need to deploy alternative resources for peacebuilding activities, which can include non-monetary contributions as well as contributions from the private sector. We should foster cooperation within the United Nations system, with the World Bank and with other regional and international financial institutions in order to assist affected countries in the mobilization and use of domestic resources for economic and social development. That is of course essential for preventing both the risk of conflict and relapsing into conflict.

I will conclude by highlighting an issue that Italy believes is at the core of building peaceful and inclusive societies, namely, the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage. The preservation of cultural heritage, in particular from terrorist acts and trafficking, and the promotion of and respect for cultural diversity are key elements in reconciliation and peacebuilding processes. No society can flourish without culture; no mutual relationship can be established without respecting people's history and soul. For those reasons, building on numerous previous activities, on 16 February Italy and UNESCO signed a landmark agreement to establish a task force to protect ancient cultural artefacts in crisis areas. Such Blue Helmets of culture, as we have called them, are a tangible sign of Italy's commitment to the Unite for Heritage campaign.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Bogaert (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I thank Venezuela for organizing this open debate.

Belgium aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union. We wish to add some remarks based on, inter alia, our participation in the Burundi and Central African Republic configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

Since the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture, the peacebuilding paradigm has changed substantially. At the policy level, the challenges linked to involvement in conflict-affected countries have been the subject of special attention, notably within the framework of international networks such as the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States and the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State-building.

The review of the peacebuilding architecture comes several months after the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), which entails a series of interrelated Goals, including those on ensuring sustainable peace, promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, providing access to justice for all and strengthening accountable and effective institutions. However, fragile countries and those affected by conflict are precisely those that have made the least progress towards the achievement of the previous Millennium Development Goals. Special attention to those countries and to the challenges that they face in terms of peacebuilding will be all the more necessary in order to ensure their inclusive development through sustainable peace. Belgium has therefore decided to allocate 50 per cent of its official development assistance to fragile and least developed countries.

That brings me to several thoughts on the work of the Security Council and its follow-up to the situations brought to its attention. These thoughts have also been inspired by our contribution to the review of peacekeeping operations. It will also be important to take into account the review process regarding resolution 1325 (2000) and the results of the upcoming World Humanitarian Summit.

Ensuring lasting peace requires better and increased investment in conflict prevention in order to prevent countries from sliding into, or back into, conflict. While progress has certainly been made, the situations that have the attention of the Security Council — including several protracted crises, the incredibly severe humanitarian consequences of which have had a devastating impact on civilians — demonstrate that such efforts are not enough. Belgium therefore calls for greater attention to be paid to the root causes, as well as to the factors and early signs of conflict, based on factual analysis.

Transition and exit strategies for peacekeeping operations should also be better organized around political processes, which should include disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security-sector reform, transitional justice, the strengthening of institutions and capacity-building. Those processes exceed the lifetime of the missions and illustrate the need to better reflect the dimensions of peacebuilding and development in an integrated approach to sustainable peace. They also imply a political commitment on the part of the host country to the goals of the actions taken to achieve lasting peace, as well as an inclusive dialogue with stakeholders on the national plan. The role of civil society and women in that inclusive dialogue will be crucial.

That leads me to mention the notion of coherence and coordination in the activities of those involved in peacebuilding. Given the scale and nature of the conflicts that we encounter, a more coherent and integrated approach and better coordination is needed, both at Headquarters and in the field.

Based on those considerations, Belgium calls for a far-reaching review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. As an advisory body of the Council, the Peacebuilding Commission can certainly add value in terms of early warning, conflict prevention, conflict resolution and transition in harmony, acting in close coordination with stakeholders at Headquarters and in the field. In any event, we must strengthen the interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Romania.

Mr. Jinga (Romania): I would like to thank Venezuela for initiating this open debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. This is a timely opportunity to discuss how to build peace in a challenging global context. With conflicts dramatically increasing in number and changing in nature, there is an urgency to develop a more fit-for-purpose United Nations response.

Romania associates itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union. I would like now to make a few remarks from my national perspective.

Former Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld once said that the United Nations was created not to lead humankind to heaven, but to save humanity from hell. Indeed, the United Nations has saved millions of lives from wars, poverty, diseases and starvation. Today, its role is once again being dramatically tested by the multiplication of threats posed to international peace and security. In less than 10 years, the number of major civil wars has almost tripled. More than 1.5 billion people live in countries affected by violent conflicts. The nature of conflicts has changed as well. We are witnessing the volatility of borders, the disintegration of States, trafficking in natural resources that finance terrorist groups and appalling violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. In many cases, the lack of solid institutions and fair and transparent governance, and the presence of corruption and the mismanagement of public funds, which cost the global economy $2.6 trillion, have made States vulnerable to terrorism and violent extremist groups. Solving crises is costly, both financially and in terms of human resources, and quite often the relapse of countries into conflict is almost predictable.

More than ever, peacebuilding is intrinsically linked to conflict-prevention. Preventing conflict is considerably less expensive than responding to it after the fact. It is also less divisive in the international community, including in the Security Council, than finding solutions after the outbreak of crisis. The United Nations has at its disposal an impressive array of tools to build peace. We see them in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), in particular in Sustainable Development Goal 16, on peace, justice and strong institutions.

As last week we paid our respect to the late former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, let me quote from his 1996 *An Agenda for Democratization*, which emphasizes the links between peace, development and democracy:

> "Without democratic institutions to channel popular pressures for development and reform, popular unrest and instability will result. The reality is that no State can long ... have the potential to pursue a successful and sustainable development strategy, if its citizens are prohibited from participating actively and substantially in its political processes and economic, social and cultural development." (*para. 25*)

The reviews of peacebuilding and peace operations, the report on mediation, the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and his Human Rights Up Front initiative are part of that same vision.

Building peace requires an integrated and cross-cutting approach, because its multidimensional nature poses challenges of coherence. We believe, therefore, that increased involvement on the part of the Security Council in preventive actions could help generate strategic planning for peacebuilding.

Romania has invested in preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, peacebuilding and mediation. Ever since we became an official development assistance donor country in 2007, we have devoted resources, including at the United Nations level, to capacity-building for public institutions, election assistance, public order, the campaign against corruption, youth and education. As a Security Council member in 2005, Romania promoted resolution 1631 (2005), on cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations in the maintenance of international peace and security. We think that much added value will come from further developing partnerships with regional organizations as an important tool for building trust in conflict prevention and in post-conflict reconstruction. In that respect, we also think that increased Security Council engagement with regional organizations, consistent with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, will bring a more focused and integrated perspective to peacebuilding.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said at the launch of his report for the coming World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul,

> "We need to restore trust in our global order and show those millions left behind in conflicts, in chronic need and in constant fear, the solidarity they deserve and expect from us."

I believe we can do that only through peace and stability. It requires good governance, opportunities for young people and fighting violent extremism. Those are the main challenges to a sustainable peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Ms. Lodhi (Pakistan): We thank Venezuela for organizing today's open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. In a world beset with conflicts, turmoil and suffering, this is an opportune moment to discuss that important subject.

Pakistan was among the pioneers promoting the idea of a dedicated United Nations institutional mechanism for peacebuilding. In 2004, Pakistan first proposed an ad hoc arrangement to draw various United Nations bodies together to address complex crises. Building on that, Pakistan actively participated in discussions on the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) during the 2005 World Summit and the subsequent negotiations on and adoption of General Assembly resolution 60/180, which established the Commission.

Peacebuilding works best, we feel, as an integral part of a continuum — from conflict prevention to peacekeeping to post-conflict reconstruction. Peacekeepers, as early peacebuilders, help to lay the foundation for durable peace. Unfortunately, the focus of the international community has remained on the conflict phase alone — so long as media attention is focused there as well — to the detriment of the other two phases. The support of the international community often wanes with the departure of television crews in the aftermath of conflict, which leaves the country concerned with weak State institutions, a power vacuum, a weak economy and a lack of financial resources — the confluence of which is a recipe for a descent into chaos.

Today, the bulk of peacekeeping resources are deployed in multidimensional missions. Resolution 2086 (2013), adopted during Pakistan's presidency of the Security Council in January 2013, was a landmark in that regard. It reinforced the strategic relationship between peacebuilding and peacekeeping.

The Peacebuilding Commission has not been able to live up to its promise. While it is an essential component for supporting peacebuilding activities, including post-conflict stabilization and the strengthening of the capacity of Governments, national and local institutions and transitional or other authorities, critical evaluation and stocktaking is necessary.

The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture is comprehensive and very thoughtful. We commend Ambassador Gert Rosenthal and the members of the Advisory Group for their work. The report rightly places emphasis on prioritizing peacebuilding, enhancing PBC's interaction with the principal organs of the United Nations and the need for political, security and development actors to support each other in striving for sustainable peace.

The failure to prioritize leads to tragic cycles of relapse into turmoil and conflict. Addressing the root causes of conflict is extremely important to avoid its recurrence, but that obviously requires long-term commitment and adequate and predictable financing. Strengthened peacebuilding is in the interest of us all. To achieve that, we need to give attention to the following.

First, we must prioritize prevention. It may be axiomatic to say this, but it remains true that the best way to deal with growing humanitarian needs is to address their root causes. Secondly, there should be a holistic approach to sustaining peace, which must involve conflict prevention, peacekeeping and post-conflict recovery and reconstruction. Thirdly, domestic resource mobilization needs to be given due importance while working on enhancing international financial support for peacebuilding and ensuring its predictability. Fourthly, greater collaboration should be encouraged between the United Nations and the World Bank Group and other regional and international partners in order to assist countries in the mobilization and effective use of domestic resources. Fifthly, inclusive national ownership is essential. In the final analysis, only national actors can drive peace processes. Sixthly, the PBC should present the Security Council with concise, realistic and context-specific recommendations and benchmarks, and the Council should regularly request and draw upon the advice of the Commission, especially while discussing mandates and reviewing peacekeeping operations. Finally, for issues such as the timing of mission transitions, decisions should be based on discussions between among the Security Council, the Secretariat, the relevant troop-contributing countries and national authorities in conflict-afflicted countries.

Countries emerging from conflict face imposing challenges as they seek to overcome the legacy of war and find a durable path to peace and security. As we move towards the final stage of the peacebuilding architecture review process, what is critical is the acknowledgement that the objective of those review efforts should be to revitalize the peacebuilding mechanism to better assist States and societies to recover from conflict and avoid a calamitous return to violence.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Bamrungphong (Thailand): Today's open debate is both timely and practically relevant, as the Security Council and the General Assembly are in the process of reviewing the peacebuilding architecture, with the objective of adopting parallel and identical draft resolutions that will set out the framework of United Nations peacebuilding for the next five years. I commend the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for choosing for this open debate a topic that can contribute in a concrete and meaningful manner to the ongoing intergovernmental negotiation process on peacebuilding.

The Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of Peacebuilding Architecture, chaired by Ambassador Gert Rosenthal of Guatemala, produced a comprehensive and aspirational report (see S/2015/490) that contains key recommendations on how the United Nations can improve its approach to peacebuilding. I once again commend the Advisory Group of Experts' efforts to provide us with a framework of ideas to tackle the challenges that peacebuilding is facing.

In response to some of the questions raised in your concept note (S/2016/104, annex), Sir, I wish to make comments on two specific points.

First, one of the key challenges identified in the report of the Advisory Group of Experts is that peacebuilding is left as an afterthought: under-prioritized, under-resourced and undertaken only after the guns fall silent. We share that assessment and are of the view that peacebuilding is not only a post-conflict activity, but should be undertaken throughout the conflict cycle. As such, it requires sustained political attention. The Peacebuilding Commission, as an intergovernmental advisory body, can play a crucial role in sustaining international attention to countries at risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict.

To have an impact, political commitment must be matched by adequate and predictable funding for peacebuilding efforts. However, the Peacebuilding Fund continues to face financial shortfalls. We must find a way to better finance peacebuilding activities. The Security Council and the General Assembly should explore resource mobilization through partnership with the private sector, along with strengthened partnership with the international financial institutions and regional development banks. The proposal of the Advisory Group of Experts to support the Peacebuilding Fund through an assessed contribution also merits careful consideration.

Secondly, many of the conflicts that we witness around the world are rooted in underlying socioeconomic problems, be it poverty, social injustice or inequalities. Thailand firmly believes that peace cannot be sustained in the absence of sustainable and inclusive development; it is about giving due regard to the needs and livelihoods of the people and their communities.

We cannot wait until the guns fall silent to start development work. For conflict-affected countries, the United Nations can play a crucial role in laying the necessary groundwork for a transition from conflict to normalcy. Our peacekeeping experience in the former East Timor, and more recently in Darfur, has shown that peacekeepers can undertake peacebuilding efforts that have an impact. Through the implementation of various development and quick-impact projects, peacekeepers can significantly contribute to alleviating socioeconomic grievances of the local population.

I wish to conclude my remarks by expressing my appreciation to the Permanent Representatives of Angola and Australia, in their capacities as the co-facilitators of the intergovernmental negotiations on the review of the peacebuilding architecture, for their able leadership. The Kingdom of Thailand remains fully committed to extending support and cooperation to the co-facilitators in this process.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Sandoval Cojulún (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Guatemala is grateful for the holding of this open debate and for the briefings by the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Machiera Kamau, and of the former Chair of the Commission, Ambassador Olof Skoog. We are also grateful for the leadership of Ambassador Gert Rosenthal as Chair of the Advisory Group of Expers on the Review of the Peacekeeping Architecture.

My delegation shares the ideas contained in the concept note (S/2016/104, annex) in the sense that the United Nations can play a key role in preventing armed conflicts from beginning, resuming or continuing. We wish to highlight that we see peacebuilding mainly as an effort to prevent conflict. Even in post-conflict situations we seek to prevent further recurrence of conflict, and peacebuilding can serve to prevent conflicts from arising at all.

We also share the view that the recent failures of the Organization have served to highlight the need to review in a broad and comprehensive manner the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. As we have repeatedly stated, peacekeeping missions should be understood as a task in which only interested national stakeholders should feel ownership. The United Nations and international actors may support and facilitate the process, but they cannot direct it. On that basis, Guatemala proudly supports various missions with military personnel in order to contribute to international peace and security. We support what was highlighted in the report (see S/2105/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts, in the sense that the United

Nations should have better operational strategies to have a closer relationship with international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations.

We see the holding of this open debate as being very timely. It creates a space to discuss and hear the different positions on peacebuilding. This exercise is particularly relevant in the light of the current negotiations of the draft resolution on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

We stress the importance of delegations using the recommendations and observations made by the Advisory Group of Experts as a solid and supportive basis for discussion. We are aware that during negotiations, the Organization's States Members will face major challenges in reaching consensus on major issues, such as the inclusion of human rights, funding for peacebuilding and defining various concepts, such as sustainable peace.

Given that the concept of peacebuilding has been on the Organization's agenda since 1992 and that international contexts are not static, Member States have a valuable opportunity to engage in an analytical discussion, based on lessons learned, on the peacebuilding architecture of the Organization. It is therefore imperative to remind the Council that greater efforts are needed to prevent conflicts. The numbers leave no room for interpretation. Investing in prevention will prevent above all the loss of human lives. but it will also allow for a better use of the Organization's limited financial resources and better performance. That point provides clarity about the importance that Member States should give to the Peacebuilding Fund and to strengthening coordination with both the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Guatemala stresses the need for the Council to ensure that any mandate for peacebuilding missions emphasizes that the importance of such missions being integrated within the United Nations system as a whole, including the Human Rights Council, in order to implement sustainable peace on the ground.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Schieb (Germany): I would like to thank Venezuela for having convened today's open debate.

Germany aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union.

What is the challenge before the Security Council? In the light of the multiplication of conflicts and failing States, the challenge is to reshape the Peacebuilding Commission to adequately address not only post-conflict situations, but also the prevention of conflicts with the support of the Peacebuilding Support Office and an adequately financed Peacebuilding Fund.

Five years ago, we failed to allow the Peacebuilding Commission to evolve after we had discovered that gaps existed between our collective aspirations and the realities in practice. Instead of adopting a substantive draft resolution, we just welcomed the report of the experts reviewing the Peacebuilding Commission, and we did not endorse a single one of the recommendations contained in the report. Given the current review prepared by the Group of Experts headed by Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, we now have the opportunity to finally enact the necessary changes.

First, the mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission needs to be enhanced to also encompass crisis prevention, not only the aftermath of a conflict.

Secondly, the Peacebuilding Commission must work more closely with the Security Council. However, that can be achieved only if the Security Council actively involves the Peacebuilding Commission in its work on crisis prevention and peacebuilding and if the Peacebuilding Commission has something to offer to the Security Council. As the report of the Advisory Group stipulates, the Security Council

> "should regularly request and draw upon the Peacebuilding Commission's advice on the peacebuilding dimensions of mandates". (*S/2015/490, p.4*)

Thirdly, we also must overcome the bureaucratic approach to peacebuilding enshrined in the country configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission. Some challenges, such as Ebola, demand a regional response, and therefore call for action beyond the limitations of one specific country configuration. That does not mean that we need to create new structures. We need to use the existing ones more efficiently through better cooperation with host countries, enhanced coordination with other United Nations agencies on the ground and more partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, as well as with international financial institutions. The Peacebuilding Commission is a product of internal and institutional learning within the United Nations. It draws upon the complex and often interrelated challenges associated with conflict resolution, peacebuilding, reconciliation and development. We just need to improve it.

Peacebuilding does not come for free. Predictable financing is an important prerequisite that had been voiced even before the Rosenthal report. Germany has been one of the main donors contributing to the Peacebuilding Fund in the past, and it will continue to be a predictable voluntary contributor in the future. In 2016, we will substantially increase our contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund.

Let me reaffirm that Germany firmly supports the ongoing negotiations on a joint draft resolution by the General Assembly and the Security Council designed to improve the peacebuilding architecture. Germany also looks forward to continue working with the Peacebuilding Commission to best respond to the needs of countries in crisis and help solidify peace in the aftermath of conflict.

Last but not least, Germany would like to use this opportunity to pay tribute to former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. It was his 1992 "Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) that prepared the ground for many of the concepts and initiatives we are discussing to this very day.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.

Mrs. Kassangana-Jakubowska (Poland): Poland considers today's debate to be an important initiative to reflect on the ongoing process of the review of the peacebuilding architecture. We fully agree with a view of Venezuelan presidency that lack of a proper attitude to peacebuilding contributes considerably to the resurgence of conflicts.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union. I would like to offer some additional remarks in my national capacity.

The social and economic development of countries in conflict or post-conflict situations is especially significant for the lasting success of peacebuilding efforts. That is why it is so important to successfully implement the ambitious 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) and to effectively reflect on why the Millennium Development Goals were not realized in full.

We are convinced that the maintenance of international peace and security cannot be discussed in isolation from the issue of good governance. The international community should fully acknowledge that there is a strong nexus between good governance principles — which include impartiality, transparency, accountability and combating corruption — on one hand, and United Nations actions undertaken with a view to assisting States in preventing, resolving and recovering from military conflicts, on the other. Promoting good governance, including through security sector reform, tackling political, social and economic exclusion, promoting human rights and opportunities for all are incredibly important to guaranteeing stability, security and peace. All such issues should have proper weight and place in the reflection process on the future of peacebuilding activities.

The United Nations has a unique responsibility for sustaining peace and security, but the scale and gravity of challenges today means that the United Nations cannot act alone. The role of regional and subregional organizations in peacebuilding cannot be underestimated. In that regard, we would like to stress the importance of coherence and complementarity in order to ensure better effectiveness of actions between United Nations and regional actors. We fully support the idea of partnerships in the peacebuilding area between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations, similar to those that exist in peacekeeping. Peacebuilding needs just as much attention.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is the most important element of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We agree with the conclusion of the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, headed by Ambassador Rosenthal, that the PBC should improve its coordination with key United Nations bodies. We should remember that the deepening of the PBC's relationship with the relevant United Nations bodies, such as the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, depends upon their approach to peacebuilding and their eagerness to draw on the PBC's knowledge. As appropriate, therefore, those bodies should seek out the PBC's expertise and assistance with the goal of maximizing the impact of the United Nations in post-conflict situations.

We recently witnessed a very good example of efforts by the Security Council to draw on the PBC's specific expertise during the open briefing (see S/PV.7624) on Guinea-Bissau earlier this month. The work of the Guinea-Bissau country-specific configuration of the PBC, under the intelligent chairmanship of Ambassador De Aguiar Patriota of Brazil, is an excellent example of a much-needed comprehensive approach to peacebuilding, involving close cooperation between the PBC, the Secretariat, the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States. We hope that such a streamlined effort will enable them to safeguard that country's achievements in stabilization and development.

There can be no doubt that we need a high level of coherence and complementarity in all three of the review processes under way in the area of international peace and security. The momentum during the intergovernmental phase must be kept up, and the role of the General Assembly in that process will be extremely important. That is why we would like to commend the initiative of the President of the Assembly in organizing a high-level thematic debate, to be held in May, designed to identify synergies between the three review processes. We believe that will help to improve United Nations action on peace and security.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. Alday González (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's open debate, and the briefers for their interesting views.

Ten years after the Organization's establishment of its peacebuilding architecture, we continue to face the challenge of finding the best way to achieve sustainable peace that can help to heal the scars caused by armed conflict, rebuild the countries and regions concerned, along with their institutions responsible for protecting fundamental rights, and provide basic humanitarian services, security and justice.

The lessons learned over the past decade have shown us that, if peacebuilding is to succeed, it requires a comprehensive strategy for addressing conflicts that can establish a consistent, solid and direct link between peace and security and human rights and development. Those elements, together with prevention, formed the preliminary framework for peacekeeping in 2005, and today they continue to be crucial to its long-term viability and effectiveness. In that context, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) should play a key role in focusing the United Nations system's efforts.

Mexico would like to acknowledge the work of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, led by Ambassador Rosenthal, as well as the efforts of the Permanent Representatives of Angola and Australia to follow up on and bring coherence to our discussions on the issue in both the General Assembly and the Council. If we are to make progress towards our goal, it is essential that, as recommended by the Advisory Group, we change the epicentre of our peacebuilding efforts from the current reactive perspective to a preventive one. The emphasis on that aspect is consistent with the recommendations and definition of critical pathways that are being discussed in the other review processes currently under way, and our shared goal should therefore be to translate the recommendations into action.

To reverse 10 years of inertia and obstacles placed in the way of the peacebuilding architecture, we will need coherent, systematic, collective efforts aimed at ending the disjunctions in the main intergovernmental bodies of the United Nations whose responsibility it is to change the paradigm in favour of sustainable peace — the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations presence must be constant or else, as with any other vacuum, it runs the risk of being occupied by others.

Given the challenges and complexity of today's conflicts, the role and added value of the Peacebuilding Commission should be exploited, enhanced and strengthened. The Security Council should make frequent use of the Commission's advisory capacity in reviewing the mandates of peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions, as well as in designing transition strategies with the timeliness and long-term vision essential to peacekeeping. The Commission should be a platform for bringing to the Council's attention the views of all of the relevant actors at the national, regional and international levels, including donors, agendas and the agencies of the United Nations system.

Peacebuilding requires the political, technical and financial support of the international community. It also requires nonvengeful justice, and for that we need the mechanisms that can provide it. The absence of that kind of support for peacebuilding and peacekeeping, particularly when it comes to the root causes of a crisis, can result in significant challenges when it comes to preventing the outbreak or resurgence of a conflict.

Mexico appreciates the Advisory Group's recommendation that our peacebuilding instruments should always work together with regional and subregional organizations in their prevention efforts, whenever their constitutive bodies allow it. We also believe that key stakeholders, such as civil society and international financial institutions, should back the Organization's efforts and contribute positively to supporting national priority areas, encouraging economic development and lessening the risks of investing in countries that are rebuilding. Requests and mandates to do more should be backed up with appropriate resources and strategic planning aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the work. We believe that it is vital to ensure that those intergovernmental processes result in a thorough analysis of the financial arrangements for the entire peacebuilding architecture and in concrete action aimed at strengthening those arrangements, including accountability mechanisms.

This period of review of various bodies and commissions is an ideal opportunity for revisiting and revitalizing the Organization's conceptual and operational approach to peacebuilding. We should take advantage of this five-year opportunity to review in depth the areas of our peacebuilding architecture that need more attention and reinforcement, taking into account proposals that favour political and inclusive solutions over military ones. In that regard, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome, and express Mexico's full support for, the establishment and deployment of the new United Nations special political mission to Colombia, authorized on 25 January. We hope that the mission, which will contribute not just to the peace process in Colombia but also to the security and stability of the entire region, will develop along the lines I have mentioned and will serve as an example for future special political missions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Algeria.

Mr. Boukadoum (Algeria): I would like to thank the Venezuelan presidency for convening today's meeting. It is a great opportunity for Member States to share their views on the ongoing review process. I would also like to thank Ambassadors Macharia Kamau, Olof Skoog and Gert Rosenthal for their introductory briefings.

I would like to briefly share with the Council some views based on the framework of the four areas identified in the President's concept note (S/2016/104, annex).

First, with regard tp the lack of attention to peacebuilding, we think that, although the concept of peacebuilding is not present in the Charter of the United Nations, it is utterly consistent with its letter and spirit. From our perspective, the efforts that emanate from the current peacebuilding architecture could, however, be immensely improved. We should begin by addressing the question of the lack of adequate resources. As expressed by the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, providing the Peacebuilding Fund annually with a symbolic 1 per cent of the value of the total United Nations budget for peace operations as core funding from assessed contributions would help close the gap between mandates and programme resources.

Secondly, regarding peacebuilding time frames, we have two contradictory notions of time frame: that of the United Nations, punctuated by successive yearly sessions, and that of human beings in post-conflict situations. The first is guided by calendaring priorities and performance, and the second is hard to assess in terms of controlled or arithmetic data, except for the time required for national reconciliation and framed social interactions to produce their expected positive effects.

Thirdly, the importance of development in peacebuilding is a sine qua non for lasting peace. Where there is development, there is the possibility of peace. Where there are issues of poverty and disenfranchisement, there cannot be peace or stability. Allow me also to stress the correlation with the rule of law at the national and international levels, as, without the rule of law, development and therefore peace in a post-conflict situation could be short-lived.

Fourthly, the important role of regional and subregional organizations in peacebuilding is something we totally support, encourage and concur with. Indeed, in the context of the African Union, we clearly highlighted this element in our submission following the invitation by the co-facilitators of the United Nations peacebuilding review to Member States to provide written contributions.

I take this opportunity to thank the Permanent Representatives of Angola and Australia for their open and transparent stewardship of the process. In the Algerian submission, we underlined, among other issues, the work that needs to be done in order to ensure that the peacebuilding architecture is well connected with and complementary to the African Union Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development Framework and the African Solidarity Initiative. I would like to take this opportunity to wish full success to the co-facilitators of the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, Ambassadors Bird and Gaspar Martins, in their endeavour, whose outcome is expected to be submitted by the end of next month.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the observer of the Observer State of the Holy See.

Brother Carroll (Holy See): My delegation wishes to thank the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for having convened this open debate on "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture".

Eleven years ago, drawing on the experience of the first 50 years of the United Nations, the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change identified a key institutional gap: there was no place in the United Nations system explicitly designed to avoid State collapse and the slide to war or to assist countries in their transition from war to peace. Consequently, following the 2005 World Summit Outcome (General Assembly resolution 60/1), the General Assembly and the Security Council created the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) as a subsidiary body of both United Nations organs. Afterwards, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) was put in place, and a Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) was also created.

The PBC and the PBSO should be praised for the work accomplished in many countries, while the PBF deserves generous and constant financial support from the Member States. However, the conclusions of the Secretary-General's Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (S/2015/490) show the complexity and difficulty of peacebuilding efforts. The ability of the PBC to engage with the host Government as well as civil society and the most important stakeholders on the ground in the conduct and implementation of coordinated actions remains crucial and difficult. In addition, there are several factors that are largely dependent on the substantive and coordinated engagement of the Security Council and other United Nations bodies in each situation. Furthermore, the ultimate success of peacebuilding relies on the attention given to the PBC by the whole international community.

Appropriately, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (General Assembly resolution 69/313, annex) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) address the special needs for financial, trade and development assistance of countries in post-conflict situations. Goal 16 of that Agenda is devoted to the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies, and all its targets are relevant for situations of post-conflict. However, in his address to the seventieth session of the General Assembly, Pope Francis noted: "Solemn commitments...are not enough, even though they are a necessary step towards solutions...Our world demands of all Government leaders a will that is effective, practical and constant, with concrete steps and immediate measures", not forgetting that "above and beyond our plans and programmes, we are dealing with real men and women...who live, struggle and suffer, and are often forced to live in great poverty, deprived of all rights" (A/70/PV.3, p. 4).

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognizes the importance to achieving sustainable development of delivering quality education to all girls and boys, including migrant and refugee children and those in conflict and post-conflict situations, and providing safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all. The same Agenda stresses that capacity development will be integral to achieving the post-2015 development agenda. It calls for enhanced international support and the establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building, especially in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations. In his speech to the General Assembly, Pope Francis noted that integral human development

> "presupposes and requires the right to education — also for girls, who are excluded in certain places — which is ensured first and foremost by respecting and reinforcing the primary right of the family to educate its children, as well as the right of churches and social groups to support and assist families in the education of their boys and girls. Education conceived in this way is the

basis for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda" *(A/70/PV.3, p. 4)*.

The Holy See, as a subject of international law, has always been a promoter of peace between countries, actively participating in the work of the United Nations, while the local churches have always been a factor of reconciliation at the national level. Churches, as well as many faith-based organizations and development non-governmental organizations, have always been at the vanguard of pacification and the reconstruction of regions and countries struck by wars and conflicts.

Moreover, the nearly 100,000 elementary schools and secondary schools as well as colleges and universities throughout the world that are run by Catholic organizations are an essential contribution to the building and maintenance of peace. The Catholic health-care network encompasses more than 25,000 hospitals; dispensaries; clinics; homes for the elderly, the chronically ill or disabled; orphanages; and child-care centres. All are a part of maintaining local, stable and secure environments, which are essential for the comprehensive approach to peacebuilding recommended in the 2015 review. The actions of the Holy See and of Catholic institutions worldwide are fully consistent with the pleas of the Council and other United Nations forums to limit the use of arms and implement strategies of dialogue and negotiation, to bridge the way to peaceful coexistence in diversity and to use the world's industrial might and technological prowess to bring about the peacebuilding aspirations of all.

In his recent visit to Mexico, Pope Francis addressed the civil authorities and the diplomatic corps and discussed the building blocks of peace. He stated,

> "[l]eaders of social, cultural and political life have the particular duty to offer all citizens the opportunity to be worthy contributors to their own future, within their families and in all areas where human social interaction takes place. In that way, they help citizens to have real access to the material and spiritual goods that are indispensable: adequate housing, dignified employment, food, true justice, effective security and a healthy and peaceful environment."

It seems to my delegation that those words of Pope Francis speak to the very essence of the peacebuilding architecture, which we are discussing here today.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mrs. Von Steiger Weber (*spoke in French*): Switzerland welcomes the holding of this debate and particularly appreciates the current attention that is being devoted to the peacebuilding architecture.

In 2015, the United Nations had to confront a great number of crises and conflicts, and what is more, it had to do so within the context of budgetary constraints. At the same time, the review of the peacebuilding architecture, the peace operations review, the review of the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) and the successful negotiations on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) provided an opportunity to scrutinize activities aimed at sustaining peace and to recalibrate the operational methods of the United Nations. One of the most pervasive insights resulting from those processes is that a fragmented approach is not sustainable. The United Nations must extend its vision beyond the existing silos and strengthen the coherence of its actions, both substantively and structurally and with regard to external partners. The same rationale played an important role in the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture in 2005. Ten years later, why is it then so difficult for us to adopt a coherent approach to maintaining peace? Our conclusion is that first, the United Nations has yet to tap its full potential with regard to peacebuilding and that, secondly, the peacebuilding architecture and its mandate are more relevant than ever.

Switzerland welcomes the draft resolution on the peacebuilding review that is currently being discussed by Member States. The text reflects the findings of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture and the inputs from Member States, which have been collected in inclusive consultations before and during the negotiation process. Furthermore, building on the experience that the peacebuilding architecture has acquired over the past 10 years, the draft resolution constitutes a strong vision for the future. Some aspects of that vision are hardly new, such as the call for increased coherence, which is to be realized not only through shared analysis and planning but also through joint programming. With regard to programming, there are valuable examples from which we can learn, such as the concerted efforts of the United Nations Development Programme and the

Department of Political Affairs, or those of the global focal point for the police, justice and corrections.

Other aspects of that vision for the peacebuilding architecture embody an evolution. In our view, the most important aspects in that evolution are the notions of sustaining peace over the long term and the architecture's preventive potential. We are convinced that the peacebuilding architecture can contribute to preventing the occurrence and recurrence of armed conflicts, and we fully support references thereto in the draft resolution. Furthermore, strengthening partnerships — particular those with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund — the importance of inclusive national ownership, respect for human rights, the meaningful involvement of women at all stages of peace processes, transitional justice, training and capacity-building should be prominently reflected in the draft resolution. We also believe that the text of the draft resolution should clearly refer to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and underscore the importance of being better able to predict the funding required for peacebuilding. A comprehensive and substantive resolution would provide the peacebuilding architecture with the necessary tools to implement its mandate with renewed vigour. We therefore fully support the thrust of the draft resolution.

A reinforced peacebuilding architecture would not infringe upon the unique role of the Security Council as outlined in the Charter of the United Nations. Rather, the impetus given by the draft resolution, once adopted, will enable the peacebuilding architecture, and in particular the Peacebuilding Commission, to better assume its advisory role vis-à-vis the Security Council and its accompanying role in assisting conflict-affected countries. The Peacebuilding Commission can, moreover, represent added value in situations in which the United Nations takes a light footprint approach. It can broaden the spectrum of substantive considerations by highlighting in particular issues inextricably tied to socioeconomic development and human rights and their links to peace and security. It can also help maintain a time horizon that goes beyond a single form of engagement and contribute to enhancing the circle of both internal and external stakeholders who collaborate in a specific situation. We are fully committed to enabling the Peacebuilding Commission and its specific country-configurations the means with which to provide the Security Council that added value.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines.

Ms. Yparraguirre (Philippines): We congratulate the presidency of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for convening this open debate.

Preventing conflicts and building peace and sustaining that peace long after the fighting has stopped have been among the biggest challenges facing the international community and the Security Council to date. For decades, the United Nations has focused much of its resources on peacekeeping. While its track record in that field is mixed, with both successes and failures, many lessons have already been learned regarding how to carry out the United Nations firefighting role better.

There is a lot of work to do, however, in the areas of conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding, which are key to real and lasting peace. The Philippines welcomes and supports the ongoing comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture aimed at strengthening the existing architecture and ensuring that it reaches its full potential. The current review should be mindful of the new realities and of the changing nature of contemporary armed conflicts.

The Philippines supports the recommendations of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture on the primacy of prevention, mediation and political solutions. We support proposals towards building coherence in delivering sustainable peace in the United Nations system through the roles of the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council, the Human Rights Council and international financial institutions.

It is deeply regrettable that with armed conflicts raging over various causes in many parts of the globe — conflicts at different stages, many of them recurring — the world still lacks the wherewithal to prevent and overcome conflicts and sustain the peace. We still see an urgent need to inform and educate the world on the vast amount of work to be done once the guns are silenced and the transition from war to development has started. There is a need to appreciate the fact that peacebuilding requires not just the involvement of a country, a group of international actors or the United Nations alone, but the commitment of the whole world to make it work.

We also need to address the misperception that peacebuilding can begin only when conflict ends. It is important to stress that the lasting peace is not achieved in a rigid, linear and sequential manner. The United Nations peacebuilding architecture should provide an infrastructure that will support the society until it is strong enough to stand on its own. Development is the linchpin of any peacebuilding initiative. Development is vital in preventing conflict and in sustaining the peace. The fact that development and peacebuilding are interconnected cannot be overemphasized.

Following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement with the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in March 2014, the Philippine Government has an ongoing peacebuilding process in Mindanao and is working on passing legislation that would grant autonomy to several provinces in Mindanao. The Bangsamoro Basic Law, once passed by the Philippine Congress, is envisioned to implement concrete initiatives linking peace and security, development and human rights.

All stakeholders remain firmly on the peace track, and no one is backing out of the peace process. A comprehensive normalization track is being put in place involving the decommissioning of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front's Bangsamoro Islamic Armed Forces, socioeconomic interventions in communities affected by the decades-long conflict, interim security arrangements, the reform and strengthening of the police force in the Bangsamoro, addressing transitional justice issues and confidence-building components. The seeds of development have been planted, and socioeconomic projects for the transformation of Moro Islamic Liberation Front camps into productive communities are continuing.

It is also worth mentioning that the Bangsamoro Basic Law carries concrete gender-sensitive provisions, which recognize that women in conflict and post-conflict situations are to be protected and empowered and should play a decisive role in peace and security mechanisms and processes. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement with the Bangsamoro is historic, not only because it signalled the end of a long-standing war in the southern Philippines, but also because it is the first peace agreement of its kind in the world to bear the signature of a woman as chief negotiator — Professor Miriam Coronel-Ferrer. Following the signing of the agreement, a woman was tasked to co-chair the Joint Normalization Committee, and three of four transition commissions are chaired by women.

While we recognize that we, the Filipino people, are the drivers and the owners of the peace process, we acknowledge the overwhelming support of the international community, which is just as crucial throughout that process. The Bangsamoro Peace Agreement is also supported by a United Nations joint programme that aims to reduce barriers to acceptance of the agreement among key actors in the affected communities. The Peacebuilding Fund helps in stimulating discussions and promoting advocacy on the draft legislation on the Bangsamoro Basic Law.

What we have learned from the southern Philippines' experience is that peace is a long and arduous process. It will not come overnight. Pitfalls and challenges will surface along the way. What is crucial, however, is that all parties remain resolutely on track.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ireland.

Mr. Donoghue (Ireland): Mr. President, I commend you for having convened today's discussion.

Ireland aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union.

I would like to focus on several aspects of this debate that are of particular interest to my country.

First, with respect to the crucial role of women in peacebuilding, Ireland concurs with the general recommendation of all three reviews that women's participation in peacebuilding is vital, both in decision-making related to peace and security, such as peace negotiations, and in the vital socioeconomic sphere, encompassing both human rights and development. The Security Council has acted as a major linchpin of this debate through its adoption of resolution 1325 (2000) 16 years ago, followed by six subsequent resolutions. However, more must be done by us all to ensure that the gains made in the normative framework on women and peace and security extend from the Council Chamber to field experience and practice.

The global study on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000), which Ireland helped to support, is the first major step towards catalysing movement in that area. Frank discussion is now needed on how its recommendations, along with the gender-related aspects of the other reviews, should be implemented. Ireland advocates the inclusion in the Council resolution on peacebuilding architecture of a clear deadline to meet the 15 per cent gender marker for financing for peacebuilding. We also see the participation of women in mediation processes as fundamental. That stems from our own experience in brokering and sustaining peace on the island of Ireland. Furthermore, we see a vital need for innovative tools and mechanisms with which to implement resolution 1325 (2000). One example of such tools is the Global Acceleration Instrument, a flexible funding mechanism and platform to spur the resolution's implementation, which will be launched tomorrow at an event co-hosted by Ireland.

Secondly, conflict prevention is at the very core of the mandate of the United Nations. The Organization was established not merely to end the Second World War in its entirety, but also to prevent a recurrence. Calls for a greater focus on conflict prevention permeate the three reviews. The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture recommends that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) act as a bridge between those sitting in the Security Council Chamber and those on the ground who witness the stirrings of conflict. The report also calls for the PBC to be afforded more flexibility, stressing the need for it to move away from the strictures of its formal agenda in order to respond to emerging crises in any country or region at any time. Ireland encourages the co-facilitators to explore with the Security Council the possible role of the PBC in identifying early warning signs of conflict. We also ask that the resolution mandate the changes needed to adapt the working methods of the PBC to the unpredictability, geographic diversity and challenges presented by today's wars and conflict.

Thirdly, with regard to mandate design, Ireland's long history of support to United Nations peace operations has afforded us an opportunity to learn from both successes and mistakes. We strongly concur with the general finding of the reviews that mandates and missions do not lend themselves to a one-size-fits-all approach. Every conflict has unique characteristics. Any United Nations mission to support countries in conflict should reflect that. Ireland supports the suggestion to establish a role for the PBC to advise the Security Council on the mandates of peacekeeping and technical assistance operations. The resolution should be coherent with the follow-up processes linked to the other reviews, in particular the peace operations review.

The publication of the reports of those three reviews represents only one step in what will be a very long process. We look forward to the high-level thematic debate to be convened by the President of the General Assembly in May. As the process evolves, we will need to address some very difficult questions. How will we go about breaking down the existing silos so as to ensure a holistic approach to peacebuilding with the principles of resolution 1325 (2000) at its heart? How can we implement the Sustainable Development Goals in a way that addresses the root causes of conflict? Are we willing to make the tough decisions regarding predictable financing in order to enhance the innovation and implementation of peacebuilding mechanisms? And how can we ensure that every step taken in New York is one more step towards resolving the challenges faced on the ground?

I thank you again, Mr. President, for convening this dialogue. Let us not forget that, in reviewing the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in all its dimensions, our fundamental goal is the prevention of war and conflict and the creation of a safer world for all.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): We thank the Security Council presidency for organizing this open debate on a highly pertinent issue. We appreciate the valuable thoughts shared by the briefers.

Emerging from the ashes of our independence war in 1971, Bangladesh undertook an arduous yet sustained process, moving from post-conflict recovery and reconstruction to nation-building in four decades. As a nation, we have yet to close certain chapters of that defining event, as is evident from our ongoing efforts to break the culture of impunity regarding the crimes against humanity and the genocide committed during the war.

The defeated ideologies of the war also tend to resurface at times to undermine the democratic, pluralist, non-communal and secular values that we cherish as a nation. Our journey from a war-ravaged, aid-dependent economy to one that is now marked by strong macroeconomic fundamentals, steady economic growth, inclusive socioeconomic development, a sound trade and investment regime and a determined effort to move towards a low-carbon pathway has also been marked by many trials and successes.

That serves to reinforce the point that peacebuilding per se is not a quick or easy fix that can take place in a linear, prescriptive fashion. Each conflict setting must carve out its own course for recovery and reconstruction leading to durable peace, in which the international community can play a supportive, catalytic role. Those insights have motivated Bangladesh to remain engaged with the work of the Peacebuilding Commission from the outset, assuming its chairmanship in 2012 and organizing the Commission's first high-level meeting the same year, under the stewardship of our Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina.

As we see it, there would be a gap in our understanding of peacebuilding if we were to consider it only from the context of post-conflict recovery. Without sustained, long-term efforts to address the underlying drivers of conflict, sufficient alacrity to read the early warning signs on the ground and a combination of will and agility to pre-empt and prevent conflicts, peacebuilding might risk becoming merely an ad hoc, piecemeal exercise. That is the overarching message that we have drawn from the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, which makes a compelling case for changing the mindset here about the way we view and engage with peacebuilding in the United Nations. In that spirit, we wish to flag five issues that we believe are cardinal to the current initiative of the review of the peacebuilding architecture.

First, peacebuilding must be owned and appropriated by the principal organs of the United Nations, in due recognition of the interaction among peace and security and development and human rights. As witnessed during the review exercise, each constituency has certain values to add to peacebuilding efforts without compromising their respective mandates.

Secondly, the desired coherence in peacebuilding will critically hinge on the level of commitment demonstrated by the Security Council on behalf of United Nations peacebuilding efforts. The Council's focused and meaningful utilization of the existing resources is expected to enhance the value of the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role and the Peacebuilding Fund's needs-driven financing support.

Thirdly, the Peacebuilding Commission's convening capacity must be leveraged to further broaden its orientation and engagements and relieve it of its rather formulaic, agenda-based approach. The interface between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund must be visible in terms of their respective outcomes, again without conceding their comparative advantages.

Fourthly, the notion of sustaining peace, as elaborated in the Advisory Group's report, is such an all-encompassing construct that it inevitably brings to the foreground the question of adequate, predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding efforts. In recognition of the useful services rendered by the Peacebuilding Fund, we see merit in the suggestion to create an assured financing stream for the Fund based on assessed contributions. If we are truly committed to giving peacebuilding a chance under United Nations auspices, we should work on finding creative ways to match the predictability of financing with the flexible, rapid-response capacity of the Fund.

Fifthly, and lastly, the primacy of national ownership defined by inclusive and accountable processes should remain at the heart of peacebuilding efforts. As we see again and again, prescriptions from outside, without sufficient buy-in among a cross-section of national actors, including women and youth, have never had a lasting impact. The potential role of peacebuilding in contributing to participatory political processes, human development, social justice and institution-building should ideally be driven by national consensus in conflict-affected situations.

To conclude, we urge the Council to ensure that the ongoing peacebuilding architecture review will turn out to be a real game-changing exercise in this seminal year for the United Nations peace and security agenda.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. Laro (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation thanks you, Sir, for organizing this open debate on the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. We also thank the briefers, Ambassador Kamau, Ambassador Skoog and Ambassador Rosenthal, for sharing their perspectives on this important topic.

Nigeria welcomes the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture. We commend the Advisory Group for the effort put into preparing the report. The report indicates that, while progress has been made with regard to the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations, considerable challenges still remain. Our statement will focus on the following recommendations in the report. First, the need for a strong partnership between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and regional and subregional organizations; secondly, the need for improved leadership and inclusive national ownership of peacebuilding processes; and, thirdly, ensuring predictable financing for peacebuilding.

Nigeria supports the recommendation made by the Advisory Group on the need for a strong partnership between the PBC and regional and subregional organizations. Those organizations are usually the ones closest to the areas of conflict, and are often the first to respond when conflicts break out. It is for that reason that we endorse the recommendation that the PBC should hold consultations with regional and subregional organizations with a view to promoting sustainable peace. We believe that peacebuilding efforts will be more effective when regional and subregional organizations, as well as countries contiguous to fragile States, are given the necessary encouragement to actively participate in peacebuilding processes.

National leadership, ownership and inclusivity are central to post-conflict peacebuilding. They must therefore be strengthened through inclusive politics. Where peacebuilding efforts are rooted in inclusive consultative processes, trust and legitimacy in the State and its institutions are likely to be enhanced. Efforts to sustain peace must start with the crafting of genuine, open and inclusive peace accords that reflect the broad aspirations of all stakeholders in post-conflict societies. On predictable financing for peacebuilding, we encourage affected States to explore domestic sources of financing for peacebuilding. In this connection, we urge Member States to provide them with technical support aimed at improving State capacity in the management of natural resources, public funds, tax collection and curbing illicit financial flows. We welcome the recommendation that the Peacebuilding Fund should have predictable financing through a symbolic 1 per cent of peacekeeping operations expenditure or $100 million, whichever is higher, annually, as core funding for the next 15 years.

Nigeria recognizes the difficulty of adopting an integrated approach to peacebuilding among United Nations entities empowered by different mandates. We therefore see merit in having one set of objectives and a single vision to guide all actors on the ground. This calls for closer coordination and integration between the Secretary- General's Special Representatives, Envoys and Advisers on the one hand and United Nations country teams on the other. We commend the Advisory Group of Experts for highlighting this issue and promoting an enhanced, integrated approach.

Finally, Nigeria reaffirms its support for the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and remains fully committed to the objectives of the process. We encourage Member States and other stakeholders to continue to render their support to the review process as we collectively seek to improve the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Finland.

Mr. Sauer (Finland): I align myself with the statement made earlier by the observer of the European Union.

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Nordic countries: Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

In today's world, conflicts are not only increasingly present, but also more complex. The need for rapid, flexible and preventive peacebuilding work is greater than ever. We must therefore ensure that the tools at our disposal are sharp and fit for purpose. We have a collective responsibility to make the whole United Nations system deliver better — before, during and after violent conflicts.

The review of the peacebuilding architecture provides us with an excellent opportunity to move this agenda forward. Allow me to highlight five aspects to which the Nordic countries pay particular attention: integration, prevention, inclusiveness, gender equality and institutions.

First, we need a more effective and integrated United Nations system. This means breaking the silos and bringing the three pillars of the United Nations system together. Cooperation must be seamless. Peacebuilding is inherently about linking security and development better together. Only through this comprehensive approach can we truly address the root causes behind fragility and conflict, while subsequently also enhancing the effectiveness of our work with our partner countries. Political analytical capabilities should be enhanced and our analysis of conflict drivers improved. There is also a need for a coordinated planning process of peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities, in order to ensure a smooth transition from peacekeeping operations to longer-term development.

Secondly, the message from all recent United Nations reviews and processes is clear. We must once and for all put prevention of conflict at the centre and guarantee adequate resources for preventive action; otherwise, we will continue aiming our resources at curing symptoms. In the long run, prevention not only saves money, but, most importantly, it saves human lives and alleviates suffering.

Peacebuilding not only prevents countries from relapsing into conflict but also from lapsing into conflict in the first place. Peacebuilding is an inherently political process, and, as such, an important answer to the call for the primacy of politics.

Another common message stemming from the peace and security reviews is the need for a more people-centred approach. This leads to my third point: inclusiveness. Inclusive national ownership is crucial to a successful peacebuilding process. The participation of local communities and civil society, including women and youth organizations, in peace and reconciliation processes must be given higher priority. The potential of youth as agents of positive change must be recognized, and we welcome Security Council resolution 2250 (2015), on youth, peace and security, adopted last December. The responsibility and accountability to ensure this widest possible inclusion remains with every individual country.

Fourthly, the genuine participation of women in all aspects of peacemaking and peacebuilding is an indispensable foundation for solid peace and sustainable development. Women's participation is crucial to the success of economic recovery, political legitimacy and social cohesion. Women bring to the table questions and concerns that are important to the entire population. Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment is an investment in the stability of societies and the prevention of conflict.

Finally, I would like to highlight the critical importance of strengthening the rule of law in countries emerging from conflict in order to help stabilize the situation, end impunity, tackle the underlying causes of conflict and build lasting peace. Effective and impartial institutions and judicial and security sectors are essential for peacebuilding. We must do more to create responsive institutions based on the rule of law.

To conclude, I want to reiterate the commitment of the Nordic countries to the review of the peacebuilding architecture. The Security Council can count on us to be engaged also in the next phase as we move towards the actual implementation of the reforms.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Hahn Choonghee (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea appreciates the initiative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to convene today's open debate on "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture". This debate is particularly timely as it takes place at a time when both the Security Council and the General Assembly are preoccupied with the negotiations over the draft joint resolutions on the review of the peacebuilding architecture.

Let me also thank the current and former Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Kamau of Kenya and Ambassador Skoog of Sweden, respectively, for their insightful briefings to the Council, each bringing unique perspectives from different phases of the review, which is in its final stage.

I also thank Ambassador Rosenthal, who has been sitting beside me throughout the entirety of today's debate, and his team for the tremendous work done in leading the Advisory Group of Experts, whose findings have stimulated very useful and vibrant discussions on the subject of peacebuilding in the first phase of the review, and the delegations of Angola and Australia, which are navigating the second phase of the review as co-facilitators of the intergovernmental negotiations.

The Republic of Korea, as the recently elected Vice-Chair of the PBC and as a member of its Organizational Committee since 2015, fully supports the statement made by the Chair of the PBC in the earlier part of today's debate.

In particular, we concur with the view that, as we work together to operationalize the outcome of the review, we need to develop the links between our collective desire to sustain peace and the principles agreed under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). In this regard, let me lay out my delegation's views on the issues proposed by the presidency in its concept note dated February 1 (S/2016/104).

First, one of the most salient observations made by the report of the Advisory Group of Experts (S/2015/490) is that the current peacebuilding architecture must overcome the perennial challenges of underpriority, underfunding and fragmentation. Taken together, these challenges are a reflection of the fact that a decade after its establishment, the Peacebuilding Commission has yet to find its proper place within the United Nations system, making it difficult to reach its full potential to prevent the outbreak, resurgence and relapse of armed conflict.

To address such shortcomings of the past decade of peacebuilding, the Republic of Korea is of the view that due institutional arrangements and political attention by the Organization should be given to peacebuilding activities, starting with members of the Security Council. As the primary organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must be a true partner and patron of sustaining peace. In this regard, the Republic of Korea applauds the recent trend seen in the Security Council to include the PBC in its deliberations, including the series of open debates convened last year during the Chile and United Kingdom presidencies, in January and November, respectively (see S/PV.7359 and S/PV.7561), as well as the Council briefing and informal interactive dialogue organized under the Malaysian presidency in June (see S/PV.7472).

Secondly, the Republic of Korea also agrees with the point articulated in the Venezuelan presidency's concept note (S/2016/104, annex) that successful peacebuilding requires extensive long-term engagement, with the recognition that it may not progress in a linear manner. After the decade-long peacebuilding experiment, one concrete lesson learned from our experience is that genuine and sustainable peacebuilding efforts cannot be limited to post-conflict activity, but rather as efforts to prevent the lapse and relapse into conflict.

Such an aspiration to prioritize the vision of long-term and sustainable peace is embodied in the concept of "sustaining peace" introduced in the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacekeeping Architecture (see S/2015/490) and later explained by its authors to the Member States. It is therefore our intention to highlight the long-term nature of peacebuilding engagement in our capacity as the Chair of the PBC's Working Group on Lessons Learned.

Thirdly, peacebuilding is a cross-cutting activity that connects the development, peace and security and human rights pillars of the United Nations. This interlinkage is of particular importance to the PBC, which was established as an intergovernmental advisory body to the Security Council and the General Assembly with a specific mandate to focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development. The Republic of Korea, as a donor to the various United Nations conflict-prevention activities, including the Peacebuilding Fund, recognizes the important nexus between development and peace and security and intends to increase its contribution in this area in the years ahead.

Finally, the importance of the role of regional and subregional organizations across the full spectrum of United Nations peace operations cannot be emphasized enough. The need to engage regional and subregional organizations in the variety of efforts undertaken by the United Nations in pursuit of peace and security has been identified in all recent reviews, including the report of the Advisory Group of Experts and the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446). The Republic of Korea is glad to see that the elements related to this particular aspect of peacebuilding have garnered consensual support among the wide membership participating in the intergovernmental negotiations.

In conclusion, the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development last September (General Assembly resolution 70/1), in particular Goal 16, which calls for peaceful societies, access to justice and inclusive institutions, presents a historic opportunity for the United Nations peacebuilding discourse to address a much broader spectrum in future. In this final phase of the review, the onus is now on the Security Council and the General Assembly to seize the opportunity and lay a foundation for the next decade of a lasting and sustaining peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. García Moritán (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, we welcome the invitation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, acting in its capacity as President of the Security Council, to participate in this important open debate on "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture". We also welcome the statements made by Mr. Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Mr. Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative of Sweden and former Chair of the Commission, and Mr. Gert Rosenthal, Chair of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, whose efforts in the process we value and warmly acknowledge. It is a great pleasure to see Mr. Rosenthal again.

My country welcomes the report of the Advisory Group of Experts (see S/2015/490) in that it has highlighted a number of the outstanding challenges we see for peacebuilding today, more than a decade after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission. Ten years after its establishment, we have a unique opportunity to make a difference. We must not waste it.

In these 10 years we have learned various lessons and found excessive fragmentation in the actions of the Organization, dispersion of efforts and some inconsistency in the strategies. Coordination among the principal organs of the United Nations that proposed establishing the Commission is today far from being effective, which is why we must analyse the deficiencies of the system and bring about its repair through concrete measures that bolster integration.

The Commission has the potential to be a bridge between the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, as well as between Headquarters in New York and field activities, bringing together all other relevant stakeholders in peacebuilding, including at the national, subregional and regional levels. Reaching systemic coherence in peacebuilding strategies should be our main objective.

The review of the peacebuilding architecture and the parallel reviews of United Nations peace operations and of resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security, are focused on prevention. The preventive approach currently favoured by the Organization is linked to the concept of "sustaining peace" understood as an ongoing process that involves the peacebuilding system not only at the post-conflict stage but also before and during conflicts. It is based on a comprehensive approach that takes into account the need to address the root causes of conflict through, inter alia, strengthening the rule of law, the promotion of sustained and sustainable economic growth, poverty eradication, social development, the promotion of democracy and respect for human rights.

The aforementioned preventive approach includes, in a necessary and decisive manner, inclusive national ownership in the peacebuilding process, that is, a fundamental involvement of Governments and of the various political and social stakeholders in the Member States involved in these processes. As the report notes, such inclusive national ownership should be encouraged, since the United Nations and international actors can support and facilitate this process, but not lead it.

In this context, we understand the need to systemically address the processes of peacebuilding, as has been done through the incorporation of a gender perspective and, perhaps with greater flexibility, reflecting on how it could work beyond the format of country configurations. Peacebuilding activities are carried out in the field, not at agency headquarters, given that domestic realities must take precedence. For this, it is necessary to have flexible approaches, since there is no single approach that will work in every case.

(*spoke in English*)

There is no "one size fits all" in peacebuilding.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

The lack of attention devoted to peacebuilding is reflected mainly in the meagre allocation of resources to the development of related activities. In that regard, we stress the need for predictable and sustainable funding for peacebuilding activities. And in that vein, we agree with the recommendation by the Advisory Group to allocate $100 million to the Peacebuilding Fund annually or, if the figure were greater, an amount equivalent to 1 per cent of the total budget of the United Nations for peacekeeping operations and special political missions, in the framework of contributions established for the budget of the Organization.

Another important point raised both in the report of the Advisory Group and in your concept note (S/2016/104, annex), Mr. President, is the need to review the time frames on which the processes and programmes towards the achievement of sustainable peace are structured. They must necessarily be longer as they refer to stages of development. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), which we approved in September 2015, proposes the promotion of fair, peaceful and inclusive societies, thereby linking the sustainment of peace and development. Peacebuilding architecture that aspires to sustain a stable international order cannot neglect these three interrelated dimensions: development challenges, financing and time frames consistent with the objectives to be achieved.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that regional and subregional organizations are also essential to partnerships that are conducive to peacebuilding processes. In that regard, in the Americas, consideration should be given to the role that could be played by the Organization of American States or other subregional organizations such as the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, the Union of South American Nations and the South American Common Market.

Argentina welcomes the fact that the issue of peacebuilding has been brought to the attention of Member States and trusts that the review of its architecture, which began with the report of the Advisory Group, will help to strengthen the Organization, giving it more effective tools to foster peace and the development of peoples.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Slovakia.

Mr. Komada (Slovakia): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and the review of the peacebuilding architecture. I should also like to thank the briefers — the Permanent Representatives of Sweden and Kenya to the United Nations, and Ambassador Gert Rosenthal — for their comprehensive presentations.

My delegation associates itself with the statement delivered earlier by the observer of the European Union. I will limit myself to a few remarks.

Advancing peace and security, and helping to build peaceful and just societies around the world lie at the heart of the work of the United Nations. Sustaining peace requires continued engagement by and greater coherence and coordination among the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, consistent with their mandates as set out in the Charter of the United Nations.

Currently, we are in a critical period for global peacebuilding, as demonstrated by our ongoing efforts to reinforce the relevance and impact of United Nations peacebuilding on a successful war-to-peace transition. We hope that the current stocktaking and analytical review of the peacebuilding architecture will result in the strengthening of its added value to overall United Nations peace efforts.

The peacebuilding architecture was established 10 years ago to prevent countries from relapsing into violence, to mobilize resources and political will, and to build national capacity for long-lasting peace and development. It was established as an integrated field that brings together different elements of conflict resolution, with particular emphasis on holistic United Nations action and the eschewal of fragmented approaches.

Today peacebuilding activities have become increasingly complex, multidisciplinary and multifaceted. Post-conflict development programmes are implemented in countries where the root causes of conflict — underdevelopment, rising inequality, denial of human rights and weak State institutions — are intricately linked. More should be done to better harmonize and adjust the mostly standard development strategies and activities of international organizations and bilateral donors to the complex political, security and social realities in conflict-affected countries. I would also underline the need for gender mainstreaming in all United Nations peacemaking and peacekeeping work. It is vitally important to better understand and explore ways to make peace more durable, and to deal with the root causes and issues that drive conflict.

More than a decade after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, we still face the challenges of how to more effectively measure, monitor and evaluate progress in the context of peacebuilding.

Chronic wars and protracted conflicts prevented the full achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in many countries around the world. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) — the next generation of development goals — acknowledges the role of violence and fragility in cycles of poverty and the important link between peace and development. The inclusion of Goal 16 and its 12 related targets in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development reflects the growing recognition of the importance of peace, safety and good governance to the traditional development paradigm. When countries transition out of conflict, Goal 16 should provide a platform for continuity of support to reforms in all rule-of-law areas, which are critical to sustaining peace.

Effective peacebuilding requires a thorough reform of the security sector in societies emerging from conflict, as the provision of security and the rule of law are assumed to be core preconditions for the achievement of sustainable peace. In unanimously adopting resolution 2151 (2014), the Security Council reaffirmed that reforming the security sector in post-conflict environments is critical to consolidating peace and stability, promoting poverty reduction, the rule of law and good governance, extending legitimate State authority and preventing countries from relapsing into conflict.

The Security Council also recognized the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund in supporting security-sector reform. Security-sector reform must remain a key element in the political processes of States recovering from conflict. Governments, regional organizations and the United Nations must continue their assistance in support of national efforts to develop security institutions that are accountable, accessible and responsive to the needs of their population.

In conclusion, I would like to underline that the relevance of civil-society engagement, including women's civil-society organizations, in peace and security matters is emphasized in both the 2015 report of the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446) and the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Mminele (South Africa): Please allow me to join other delegations in congratulating you, Mr. President, for having convened this timely and informative debate. Let me also congratulate the co-facilitators of the intergovernmental peacebuilding architecture review, the Permanent Representatives of Angola and Australia, on the excellent manner in which they are moving the process forward. I assure them of South Africa's support. I also wish to thank Ambassadors Kamau, Skoog and Rosenthal for their briefings.

My delegation recognizes that the core message of the reviews of the peace operations is that conflict prevention must be a central component when considering the necessity for peace operations. In that respect, United Nations cooperation with regional and subregional organizations is integral to sustaining international peace and security.

The report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (see S/2015/490) also acknowledges that the task of sustaining peace globally goes beyond the capacity of what the United Nations can deliver on its own. Partnerships with local communities, regional and subregional actors, donors and civil society are essential to make peace sustainable.

South Africa is encouraged by this aspect of the report and the progress made by the United Nations in strengthening its partnerships with regional organizations, particularly the efforts to institutionalize its relationship with the African Union. Cooperation with regional and subregional organizations is critical, as the need for sustainable development in post-conflict scenarios is contingent on the regional environment in which these countries exist. In that regard, my delegation calls for greater synergy between the efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission and those of regional and subregional organizations, in particular the African Union and its post-conflict reconstruction and development policies and organs.

Some of the key conclusions and recommendations emanating from the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture also remind us that the United Nations has the core mandate of sustaining peace. As a result, that thread must flow throughout all of the Organization's engagements, from preventative action to peacemaking, peace enforcement, peacekeeping and post-conflict recovery and reconstruction engagement. That mandate must inform and be incorporated across all the sectors and phases of action. It is for those reasons that South Africa supports the recommendation that the challenge of sustaining peace should be assumed by the entire United Nations system, including the three relevant intergovernmental organs. South Africa believes that such efforts should include other role-players, such as the international financial institutions, the private sector, local communities, regional and subregional organizations and donors.

My delegation is supportive of having the Security Council exercise some flexibility in its working methods in order to allow the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) to effectively play its role in advising the Council on institution-building in post-conflict situations. We encourage the Security Council, working in consultation with the PBC, to make sure that peacebuilding tasks related to institution-building are working in an appropriate synergy with all peacekeeping mandates.

The report of the Advisory Group of Experts also calls for a people-centred and inclusive approach at the national level that will provide a common vision to all domestic stakeholders. South Africa fully supports that approach and believes that national ownership of peacebuilding efforts is at the core of creating sustainable institutions in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The international community has the obligation to build on national efforts and advise countries, based on the priorities that they have identified for themselves. The United Nations and the international community in general should support and complement national efforts towards the development of institutions immediately after the signing of a peace agreement and the end of open conflict, in order to support the newly found peace. Where peacekeeping operations exist, capacity- and institution-building should be simultaneously pursued if conditions so permit.

We support the need for the Peacebuilding Fund to leverage funding so as to catalyse additional voluntary contributions, and for the Fund to consider developing a new funding area around efforts to strengthen the capacity of regional organizations.

Finally, my delegation maintains the view that institution- and capacity-building in post-conflict countries requires a substantial injection of resources and more predictable funding. Consideration should be given to having the United Nations finance the Peacebuilding Fund from its assessed contributions, as recommended by the Advisory Group of Experts, in order for the United Nations to achieve its objective of sustaining peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Laassel (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I would like to thank the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for organizing this debate at a time when the international community is striving to review the peacebuilding architecture. We also congratulate you, Mr. President, for the quality and clarity of the concept note (S/2016/104, annex) that you have shared with Member States.

The review of the peacebuilding architecture is entering its final phase, with the intergovernmental negotiations on the identical draft resolutions to be adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. I would also like to also thank Ambassador Skoog for his briefing, which was edifying, and pay a heartfelt tribute to the work carried out by Ambassador Rosenthal and the members of the Advisory Group of Experts. My delegation also welcomes the briefing by the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Kamau, and reiterates its full support to him.

Since the establishment of the PBC, 10 years ago, significant progress has been achieved, first, in understanding the specific challenges that emerge from conflict and, secondly, in better coordinating international efforts, including among United Nations entities. However, further progress can still be made through our collective efforts, in particular in improving our ability to mobilize resources over the long term and in coordinating the actions of various donors in order to support the strategies that have been worked out with the Governments concerned.

The Kingdom of Morocco is engaged in peacebuilding activities, both at the bilateral level and at the level of the United Nations as a member of the Peacebuilding Commission for third time since its establishment and in its capacity as Chair of the PBC's Central African Republic country-specific configuration since January 2014. In that context, the Kingdom of Morocco supports the review of the peacebuilding architecture, and its interlinkage with the strategic review of peace operations and the review on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) is crucial. Those reviews will, we hope, allow us to harmonize all the intervention modalities within the United Nations in countries in conflict or emerging from conflict — from prevention to post-conflict stabilization, peacekeeping and the management of the transitional period. In that regard, we welcome the initiative taken by the President of the General Assembly to hold a high-level debate on peace and security in May.

I would now like to highlight some particular points that seem to us to be of central importance.

The review invites us to change our understanding of peacebuilding and to view it through a broader prism. The complexity of the new conflicts facing the international community transcends the traditional view of conflict resolution followed so far, as was noted by the Advisory Group of Experts. Any peacebuilding process should be part of a holistic approach that combines all actions — from prevention to restoring peace, peacekeeping and post-conflict State-building.

The interaction among the various United Nations actors and external actors in peacebuilding should be reviewed so as to ensure better synergy in the efforts carried out both at the strategic decision-making level and in the field. Peacebuilding must also be carried out from a multidimensional perspective that takes into account the economic, political and social aspects of the conflict.

Secondly, we must ensure that all components of a post-conflict society, all movements and all political and ethnic allegiances are included. That is a prerequisite for the success of peacebuilding efforts. Looking for peace should not be a goal in and of itself. Rather, peace must be constantly maintained and should be considered as a way to bring about security, prosperity and the well-being of affected populations. In order to be definitive and lasting, peace must emerge from within the society in conflict and not be imposed from outside. A peace that does not bring together all the vital forces of the country cannot last.

Peace should not be viewed in a standardized and uniform way or applied in a one-size-fits-all manner. A simplistic vision of peace that does not take into consideration the particularities of every situation, the priorities and sensibilities of each population will be doomed to failure.

The involvement of women in the early stages of the peace process is essential, given their proven role in easing tensions, promoting economic recovery and strengthening political legitimacy and social cohesion. Civil-society actors and non-governmental organizations must also be involved to a greater extent in the work of the PBC. Their presence on the ground and their knowledge of the situation in the country, as well as their analytical capabilities, allow them to make relevant proposals on the long-term strategies that need to be adopted.

The transition process at the end of the mandate of a United Nations mission must be carefully planned and based on an objective and careful analysis of the situation under review and must not be the result of purely budgetary or logistical considerations.

The transfer of responsibilities between a mission and the country office continues to be problematic, given the differences in human and financial resources between those two entities. It is for that reason that the capacities of country offices should be further strengthened.

Thirdly, it is time that the PBC's role and position in the peacebuilding architecture be given the recognition and interest they deserve. Having an advisory role, the PBC is called on to support the work of the main organs of the United Nations and to coordinate their peacebuilding efforts within the framework of an integrated and global approach. The Council has to increase its interaction with the PBC and its country-specific configurations beyond simply looking at annual reports of the Commission and the periodic reports on the six countries on its ageanda. Called on to fulfil the three main functions under the mandate, namely, political support, the mobilization of resources and ensuring coherence among various actors in peacebuilding, the PBC and its country configurations have become a major player in maintaining peace and promoting development in post-conflict situations. The Commission and the country configurations must be systematically invited to take part in the deliberations of the Council, which should take fully into account their contributions and proposals.

Fourthly, mobilizing appropriate financial support in a structured, predictable and lasting way is the key to the success of peacebuilding actions. Without the appropriate financial resources to provide financial support, the initiatives aimed at bringing together all parties to a conflict to disarm former combatants, integrate them into society, restore State authority, reform the security and justice sectors and provide economic recovery are at risk of not being achieved. The stakeholders, be they of the United Nations, local stakeholders, Goverments, the private sector, regional organizations or international financial institutions, must cooperate in order to define as closely as possible the funding needs for peacebuilding activities in post-conflict countries.

The Peacebuilding Fund is one of the components of the peacebuilding architecture that has had an extremely positive impact since its creation. Success means that it is now a recognized and viable actor when it comes to financing in post-conflict situations. Nonetheless, although its track record is largely positive, the Peacebuilding Fund cannot simply content itself with voluntary contributions coming from members. More interactions, and not only with donors, will enable it to inform all Member States on the numerous projects financed by the Fund. Those steps, which are being put in place, would enable it to broader the donor base and encourage even those countries that already contributing to the Fund to increase their contributions.

The work carried out by the PBC on generating domestic resources and local tax collection, the fight against illegal flows and support for the proper use of natural resources must be strengthened, together with international financial institutions, in order to allow countries emerging from conflicts to particpate equally in the economic recovery of their economies.

Fifthly, peacebuilding efforts can be successful only if they are part of a global and integrated development strategy that fights the deep underlying causes of conflicts and meets the hopes and socioeconomic aspirations of countries emerging from conflicts. Peace and development are independent and indivisible. To be efficient and have lasting effect, peacebuilding must take into account and attempt to resolve the underlying causes of conflict. Rebuilding a viable economy after a long period of conflict remains one of the more difficult challenges within the peacebuilding process. A country emerging from conflict has to be able to ensure macroeconomic stability, create jobs and generate economic growth. Convinced that South-South cooperation has become essential because of the urgency and scope of challenges facing developing and fragile States, Morocco works bilaterally and trilaterally to put together specific and diversified partnership projects in productive sectors, stimulating growth and creating jobs that help with human development and directly affect the lives of citizens.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Meza-Cuadra (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): We welcome the initiative of holding this open debate, which gives us an opportunity to consider the current United Nations architecture review process for peacebuilding in post-conflict situations. We are particularly grateful to Ambassador Rosenthal, who is here today, for the valuable report (see s/2015/490) he presented, as well as to the briefers for their presentations made this morning.

Since the foundation of the Organization, the international community has understood that peace is not merely the absence of conflict. That is why the Charter of the United Nations sets out three fundamental and interdependent pillars that are mutually reinforcing: ensuring international peace and security, achieving development and promoting and protecting human rights. In the same vein, last year we adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), which indicates that sustainable development cannot be achieved without peace and security and that these are at risk without sustainable development. In that context, we believe it is important to mention the direct relationship between sustainable development Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda with peacebuilding, given that building of stable, fair and peaceful societies in which human rights are respected and promoted, thus enabling participation in the political, social and cultural life of a country, would be the best guarantee for lasting peace.

With that interdependence in mind, over 10 years ago we decided to build a peacebuilding architecture for the United Nations with a view to permanently breaking the cycle of conflict by attacking its root cuases. Unfortunately, in this review process we have noted the limited impact of the structure when developing its work of supporting States that have suffered the consequences of conflict during the process of peacebuilding. We agree with the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture on the need to adopt a series of measures to improve actions in the field and give direction to peacebuilding, leaving behind the problem of fragmented responsibilities across the agencies of the United Nations system. My delegation believes that the Peacebuilding Commission must play a role of coordination, promoting synergies and connections between the main bodies of the Organization and agencies of the system responsible for supporting States that have suffered from the results of conflict. That should be complemented with its main function of supporting States in post-conflict situations by applying policies drawn up by national Governments in accordance with their priorities, bearing in mind the interdependence among security, development and human rights.

Peru has always expressed its strict adherence to the principle of national ownership of the execution of national development plans in the process of peacebuilding in post-conflict situations. For we believe that peacebuilding is inherently an internal political process, where the Government of a country that has suffered from a conflict must work with the political forces, former combatants and civil society organizations in order to achieve national reconciliation and set national priorities for development. The work of the United Nations should be to facilitate that process by providing assistance, political support and the necessary financing to establish the basis for lasting peace.

Peru believes that the scope of the challenge of maintaing lasting peace requires that the United Nations establish broader strategic and operational links with regional and subregional organizations, as well as with international financial institutions. The latter is fundamental to ensuring appropriate financing for the work of peacebuilding on the ground. Peru also believes that the General Assembly should review the appropriateness of providing greater resources to develop peacebuilding activities, as well as to strengthen the Peacebuilding Support Office.

In conclusion, I believe that that the United Nations should adopt a holistic focus that includes preventive diplomacy actions in support of the processes of peaceful conflict resolution, preventing the relapse of conflict and making peacebuilding possible. In that regard, early warning systems should be adopted to prevent conflicts in strategies and the actions of all United Nations agencies, particularly those directly involved in development work. The adoption of such a holistic focus will make it possible for us to resolve the fragmentation of the system when it comes to peacebuilding processes and include the objective of attaining lasting peace as the realization of the mission of the Organization to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Estonia.

Mr. Jürgenson (Estonia): I would like to thank the Venezuelan presidency for organizing today's timely debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture.

Estonia aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union and would like to make the following remarks in its national capacity.

The international community still witnesses too many countries relapsing into conflict within short periods of time. While there have been notable successes in peacebuilding, it is important to note that, 10 years from the inception of the peacebuilding architecture and five years from the previous review, we are yet to realize its full potential. That serves to underline the importance of focusing on concrete steps on how to make the peacebuilding review lead to concrete results. Estonia would like to highlight the following aspects that are crucial for bringing the full potential of peacebuilding to the fore.

We must put the prevention of conflict at the centre if we are serious about sustaining peace. That was one core message that came out from last year's reviews — the United Nations system needs to strengthen its ability to prevent conflicts from reoccurring. Peacebuilding is primarily a political process that requires long-term engagement. It should address the structural causes of conflicts as well as contemporary risks of recurrence. One of the most effective ways to sustain peace and prevent conflict is by building national capacity, strengthening domestic institutions and supporting good governance. In that context, I would also like to highlight that sustainable development is crucial for sustainable peace.

Peacebuilding should no longer be viewed as merely a post-conflict activity, but rather the challenge to meet in order to sustain peace throughout the complete cycle of our engagement. In that regard, Estonia would like to underscore the importance of linking the peacebuilding review to the Secretary-General's review of peace operations, the review of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security, and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). This holistic approach of addressing the interdependence between peace, security and development should include the protection of human rights, including attention to women's rights, whose meaningful participation in peace consolidation can significantly improve the results.

Better coordination is needed if we are to strengthen peacebuilding. Effective national, regional and international partnerships enable more relevant approaches to targeting specific peacebuilding needs to be jointly developed. The United Nations system — both at country level and at Headquarters level — needs to work in a more coordinated fashion. To that end, Estonia, in its capacity as the Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council, has participated in discussions with the Peacebuilding Commission on finding ways to strengthen cooperation between the two bodies.

Lastly, more predictable and sustained funding is required to achieve the full potential of the peacebuilding architecture. Estonia has supported the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) since 2013, as we believe that the PBF is an effective peacebuilding instrument for providing catalytic, fast and flexible assistance. However, since the PBF remains a relatively small-scale strategic fund, it has to be complemented by longer-term commitments from other financing sources, such as multilateral and regional development banks.

The increasing number of violent conflicts across the globe serves as a strong reminder of why we need to attach greater importance to peacebuilding, as it is an important avenue for conflict prevention. Estonia believes that we need to use the opportunity that the peacebuilding review offers to produce bold, concrete and significant outcomes for reinvigorating the peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Medan (Croatia): We thank the Venezuelan presidency for holding today's timely debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture.

Croatia aligns itself with the statement delivered earlier by the observer of the European Union. I would like to make some additional remarks in my national capacity.

Croatia welcomes the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts and fully supports its conclusions that the United Nations must see sustaining peace as the core task set by the Charter of the United Nations. Peacebuilding should not be regarded as a peripheral activity within the United Nations but as a high priority.

The concept of peacebuilding has evolved since the inception of the peacebuilding architecture, reflecting the changing nature of international threats in an ever-changing world. Originally conceived in the context of post-conflict recovery efforts to promote reconciliation and reconstruction, the term peacebuilding has more recently taken on a much broader meaning. There is recognition that the peacebuilding should not be limited only to post-conflict engagement.

Many agree that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) should adapt to a rapidly changing environment. In that context, we share the view that we have to use the review of the peacebuilding architecture in order to make the Peacebuilding Commission more relevant and efficient.

We welcome the considerable accomplishments achieved by the PBC since its establishment, in 2005, but we also recognize that it is facing with many challenges. There is an impression that the expected impact of the PBC is far from being fully achieved. In that context, we believe that additional improvements of the Commission's working methods, as well as their rationalization, would be welcome. There is also a need for improving and strengthening the relationship between the PBC and the three principal United Nations organs — namely, the General Assembly, Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — as well as other relevant actors.

Croatia advocates for a holistic, people-centred, country-tailored approach to peacebuilding that recognizes national specificities, respects regional expertise and empowers local actors. At the same time, international efforts should be more effectively integrated into locally and regionally owned efforts towards building peace. Croatia also advocates for the need to facilitate and build broadly inclusive national ownership. We believe that women's empowerment greatly contributes to enhancing inclusivity and cohesion, and therefore welcome the fact that the PBC continues to attach importance to the role of women in peacebuilding and their contribution to building and sustaining peace. We also stress the importance of the inclusion and empowerment of youth in national peacebuilding priorities and actions. We welcome the fact that the PBC recognizes the indispensable role played by young people in any effort to sustain peace. For peacebuilding efforts to be successful, long-term political and financial support is needed, as well as partnerships among local communities, Governments, the private sector and regional and international organizations, including international financial institutions.

Peacebuilding requires the sustained and coordinated commitment of national, regional and international actors. Sustaining peace requires coherent and coordinated action among the principal organs of the United Nations, between Headquarters and the field, and among different peacebuilding actors. There is also the need for a parallel focus on political, security and development issues. We therefore believe that the review process of peacebuilding architecture should be linked to other review processes — namely, the review of peacekeeping operations and the review of the progress in the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) — as well as to a new sustainable development agenda. All those processes should establish strong linkages among peace, security, development and human rights. True, comprehensive development cannot be achieved and sustained without peace. Likewise, peace cannot be achieved or sustained without justice, and peace, development and justice are not possible without respect for human rights.

The peacebuilding architecture review process gives us a chance to improve our prospects for advancing the course of peacebuilding, and that opportunity should not be missed. Finally, let me reiterate Croatia's strong support to such efforts.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Mendoza-García (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): We congratulate you, Sir, and the Venezuelan Mission for the work it is doing this month during its presidency of the Security Council and for having convened today's open debate on a subject of vital importance for my delegation. We thank the Ambassadors of Kenya and Sweden and Mr. Rosenthal for their briefings earlier today.

As a peace-loving nation that voluntarily disarmed 67 years ago, Costa Rica is a firm believer in the peaceful settlement of conflicts between peoples and between States within a framework of international law and multilateral diplomacy. That decision was made based on our conviction of the importance of contributing to international peace and security, principles that govern our foreign policy. It is vital that we exchange the logic of confrontation, blame and war for one of good faith, goodwill and peace.

As is stipulated in its Charter, the main objective of the United Nations must remain the maintenance of peace, which requires that we act preventively and in a timely fashion and that we be capable of preventing conflicts and of maintaining a presence during and after them. The post-conflict period is a critical stage, and under no circumstances should be pushed into the background. Since its creation, the United Nations approach to the maintenance of international peace and security has evolved significantly. The global dynamic has changed, with the emergence of new types of conflicts and movements. The situation is more complex and the clashes last longer, and therefore the international Organization has to be more adaptive. Modern conflicts have tended to transcend borders, entering a new, transnational dimension. While that makes the role of the United Nations a fundamental one, it does the same for the regional and subregional organizations that take on a more specific responsibility for conflict areas. In that regard, creating alliances is crucial.

Since the maintenance of peace is the principal objective of the United Nations, it is essential that we have shared responsibility and that all its Members focus seriously on prevention, reconstruction and post-conflict recovery, not just on the imposition of peace. The fragmentation and lack of cohesion in the United Nations are major problems that pose significant obstacles to peacebuilding, and we have to address and solve them and thus provide a speedy response to them.

We should place great emphasis on preventing conflicts, both operationally and structurally. The big challenges to peace require, among other things, establishing greater economic equity, building sustainable development, human security and effective democratic participation, and replacing a culture of violence with a culture of peace. Violent conflicts are often a symptom of the existence of profound inequalities, social exclusion, violations of human rights and a lack of good governance and the rule of law, to name only a few. Our challenge is arriving at transitions to lasting peace that can enable democratic participation in decision-making and the full implementation of the Goals, targets and indicators of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). Achieving sustainable development is a prerequisite for preventing relapses into conflict.

Peacebuilding definitely requires more time than we currently allow it. We must work on post-conflict reconstruction by rebuilding legitimate institutions and restoring the people's trust. That requires adequate transition time and careful attention to human rights, security and sustainable development. That is how to build inclusive, sustainable peace that is not imposed and runs no risk of relapsing into conflict.

Women's participation is and will remain essential to maintaining peace. As stated in the Secretary-General's report (S/2010/466) on women's participation in peacebuilding and the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the

Peacebuilding Architecture, women are crucial partners in the transition from war to peace. They are key agents in promoting social cohesion, political legitimacy and economic recovery. We must also continue to demand respect for the policy of zero tolerance for sexual abuse.

In regions as diverse as Central Asia, Africa and the Middle East, many countries are struggling to address the root causes of conflict, while in January 2014 the Presidents and Heads of State of Latin America and the Caribbean proclaimed the region a zone of peace and reiterated their continued commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, with the goal of banishing forever the use or threat of use of force in our region. Our Heads of State also stressed the commitment of the States of the region to complying strictly with their obligation not to intervene, directly or indirectly, in the internal affairs of any other State and to observing the principles of national sovereignty, equal rights and the people's right to self-determination.

We are very happy with the joint statement of 19 January issued by the Government of Colombia and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia committing to their final peace accords. That goal became even closer with the Security Council's unanimous adoption, on 25 January, of resolution 2261 (2016), which creates a political monitoring and verification mission that will have the support of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States. On top of that came the announcement, on 16 February, of the creation of a post-conflict stabilization and peacebuilding fund. There can be no question that the support we provide to that peace process will be of benefit to the whole world. Costa Rica hopes that Colombia will achieve its longed-desired irreversible transition from war to sustainable peace with the support of the international community.

My delegation believes that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are necessarily achieved through the promotion of a culture of peace. We are talking about an educational task based on studying and preventing conflict, eliminating cultural violence, and promoting disarmament, as well as educating people so that dissent and non-conformism do not become triggers of violence. Peace will continue to be a constant challenge demanding means, resources, personnel and thoughtfulness.

The existence of the University for Peace sends a message that tells the entire world that peace is not born out of nothing but is rather the result of a constant building process, a question of responsibility to humankind and one that must be worked on if it is to be achieved. In that regard, we are very honoured that Costa Rica hosts that academic institution, in recognition of our pacifist, democratic, unarmed civic tradition and on our trust in the multilateral system and international law as our only instruments of defence.

At this seventieth anniversary of the United Nations, the three review processes connected to peace — of peace operations, the peacebuilding architecture and women and peace and security — have taken on great importance. What is crucial now is to be able to integrate them and, above all, to truly understand and apply the experts' recommendations. It is vital that we meet Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda, which we must all support in order to promote and strengthen security at both the national and international levels by strengthening democracy and human rights and promoting respect for the rule of law. The world we bequeath to future generations demands an enduring and collective effort if we are to build a lasting and sustainable peace for all.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Paraguay.

Mr. González Franco (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Government of Paraguay, I would like to congratulate your country, Mr. President, on the way it has led the Security Council this month, enabling us to hold important debates on issues that demand urgent and thorough attention on the part of the membership of the United Nations. Today we meet to discuss its new peacebuilding architecture, an issue that is particularly important considering what a challenge it is to try to achieve settlements, peace and reconciliation for post-conflict societies.

One might think that the importance of peacebuilding and its architecture is merely relative, vital only to those countries that endure the tragic experience of conflict. But the level of attendance and interest in this debate underscores the commitment that every State made to the task of adapting its structure, procedures and multilateral approach to today's new requirements in order to make them clearly more effective.

While the current peacebuilding architecture is barely 10 years old, the pace of events and the results we have achieved have brought us to the realization that where we are now is at the end of a phase. As a nation that promotes peace, we contend that complying with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations demands that we come up with new methods of work that include early warning systems and effective monitoring mechanisms. That can be achieved through budgets that are more needs-based, the more efficient management of available financial resources and better-trained human resources, all of this within a modern institutional framework that will enable us to sustain peacekeeping results. But above all, it will enable us to prevent a relapse into conflict.

I need not remind the Council that billions of dollars have been allocated for quite some time now by the international community to programmes aimed at stabilizing post-conflict situations, without the necessary conditions for sustainability required to ensure that their effects are perceptible in the medium and long terms. In such cases, we could affirm that, given the absence of such a structure and objectives, the resources of States have not been efficiently used in the context of the weakening and exhaustion of funding sources.

We therefore highlight the crucial importance of coordinating efforts to ensure that the effects and benefits of development are linked with those resulting from similar endeavours undertaken on the basis of the guiding principles of peacebuilding, as there is no doubt that the progress made in terms of development will inevitably have the effect of consolidating the prevailing elements that strengthen peacebuilding and improve post-conflict conditions.

Finally, and without suggesting this is less important, we want to stress the necessary and urgent optimization of resources that should accompany any reformulation of the peacebuilding architecture. We believe that regardless of the modalities for reformulation, it would be unacceptable to think of yet another drain on financial resources without clearly defined objectives and results, as has happened in the past. The international community is already engaged in too many joint efforts, such as achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and a new climate change agenda, to stress only the most important, which require ongoing and increasing efforts in all areas and the maximal optimization of existing and future resources.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Minah (Sierra Leone): I wish to commend the Venezuelan presidency of the Council for convening this important debate. It is indeed timely that we are here today while elsewhere deliberations continue on the twin draft resolutions concerning the Advisory Group of Experts report (see S/2015/490). I would like to commend the work of the Swedish chairmanship of the Peacebuilding Commission and wish Ambassador Kamau the very best as he assumes the post of Chair. I would also like to acknowledge the work of the co-facilitators of the intergovernmental process and commend them for the way in which they are guiding our work.

With your indulgence, Mr. President, I will submit my written comments as part of the record, but I will now address certain salient points which I believe have arisen during the course of our debate.

The issue of sustaining peace is the central focus of the Advisory Group of Experts report. For that we commend Ambassador Rosenthal and his team for focusing our attention on the urgency of the matter. As far as Africa is concerned, it has been a key beneficiary of the peacebuilding efforts of the Organization and of key partners. We realize, however, that we need to do more. We fully expect and hope that the guns of conflict will grow silent by 2020, and that is reflected in our "Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want". Africa welcomes the key recommendations of the Advisory Group of Experts report, and we believe that it provides us a way forward.

On the issue of the definition of sustaining peace, or peace sustainability, we believe that on this issue a compelling case has been put forward by Ambassador Rosenthal and his team. It is now a question of the evolution not only of our thinking but also of practical, political and diplomatic responses to the report. The old thinking of peacebuilding as post-conflict, or thinking of peacebuilding as something that happens when considering a relapse into conflict, is now outdated. We fully concur with that position.

Peacebuilding encompasses a whole range of activities on conflict prevention. It starts before a conflict is fully realized, when we see the causes of conflict gathering. In the deliberations we have had today, the issues have focused on financing and the viability of the report. I do believe that the consensus is that the report is well received and its core recommendations are worthy of our strong consideration. But beyond accepting the report and beyond praising the report, it calls for compelling action. Time is of the essence. The Organization, both within its core institutions, agencies and committees in-house and those in the field, needs to evolve and adapt to the new realities. Africa, as one of the primary beneficiaries of peacebuilding efforts, welcomes a greater, innovative partnership with the United Nations. We believe that the African Union Peace and Security Council and the Security Council together can deepen their relationship for the benefit of all.

With the reports that were recently delivered to us–the Advisory Group of Experts report and the Secretary-General's report (S/2015/716) on women and peace and security and the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000)- and with all the elements that we have to consider, it is important that we do not waste time. We welcome the deliberations on the draft resolutions, but we are concerned that the question of financing seems to be a sticking point. It is quite clear that for peacebuilding, or rather sustainable peace, to take hold, there has to be clear, predictable financing.

We take on board the concerns of those States and those delegations that are concerned that assessed contributions may not be the way to go. However, we believe that multi-year voluntary contributions must be the minimum standard. It is for those delegations that consider that the assessed contributions route might be problematic, given the United Nations financial system, namely, the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to make the case that there is another option that is equally satisfactory. The need for funding is critical to all that we hope the Peacebuilding Fund, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Commission will evolve and become. Without it, they will not fulfil our best hopes.

The issue of financing is one that I believe we can resolve. It is possible to create a mechanism of oversight that can look at both a twin track of assessed and voluntary contributions and report to the Council and to the Commission on its success during a pilot phase. I do not believe that we have to choose one or the other. The course of the deliberations during the discussions on the draft resolutions appears to have moved away from the symbolic 1 per cent, the $100 million mark. However, as has been reported and noted here in the Council, the figure, the symbolic 1 per cent is a mere drop in the ocean of the billions in funds that are devoted to peacebuilding and humanitarian programmes. It is not, therefore, wildly ambitious; we believe that it is, in fact, quite modest.

We believe that the Secretary-General's marker of 15 per cent for gender mainstreaming in all peacebuilding programmes is similarly modest and something that we should heartily embrace. Research shows that, in any peacebuilding process, the effect of having women fully involved increases the chances of success. Sierra Leone has been cited as an example of a relative success in terms of peacebuilding, and for that we are grateful for the work of the Council and all those who supported us on our journey. From our darkest hours, days and months, we have evolved into a fully functioning State, with institutions that are growing stronger every day. As everyone is aware, the advent of Ebola knocked back some of the gains made in peacebuilding and threatened others. However, with the support of the Organization, we believe that we are on our way to economic recovery.

It is quite true that peacebuilding can only be an adjunct to the efforts of the national Government. All national Governments have the authority to take care of their citizens in terms of stability and economic security. However, when one has a situation in which the national Government has perhaps collapsed, asymmetric warfare has taken hold and rebel groups roam the territory of a particular nation, it is time for the United Nations to step in. But as the report clearly indicates, there are markers before one gets to the full-blown conflict, that is, indicators that the peace, stability or security of the State are jeopardized. The report quite properly calls for our attention and focus at that time, prior to conflict, the outbreak of hostilities and the breakdown of society, and we welcome that focus.

I do not believe that we need to have an in-depth debate about what the report posits as peace sustainability or sustaining peace. I do believe that we should concentrate our attention on the challenges of peace sustainability. That requires in-house reform, the evolution of the institutions within the house and efforts on the ground. Sierra Leone has also been posited as an example of a situation where the mission evolved from a classic peace operation into an integrated mission. That integrated mission was not integrated simply as a matter of theory, but actually as a matter of fact. The concept of the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General, combining the roles of the Resident

Representative and of the Resident Coordinator of the United Nations Development Programme arm, was novel and worked successfully. In effect, the mission — the integrated office — was domesticated within the national institutions of Sierra Leone. By that I mean that the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General had full access to all the organs of the Government, including the presidency.

While we look to the past for examples, we must look to the future and commend the work that the Peacebuilding Fund, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Commission have undertaken to date. In order for them to do more, it is important that we answer the question of financial sustainability and that we also ensure that they have the political impetus and direction to evolve as they should.

We welcome the deliberations and efforts on the part of all organizations, including civil society and other multilateral and financial entities, which are focused on the issue of peacebuilding and the future of peace sustainability. It is perhaps fitting that the Council, which gave birth to the peacebuilding architecture, remains engaged today on the issue.

The test of our efforts and the test of any success that we can claim will be borne out when the least advantaged of populations in conflict societies can see a measure of hope and a future where the conflicts that have inflamed them will end. Beyond ending the conflict, it is important that the economic drivers of peace be fully embedded. That requires the work of the development financial institutions and international financial institutions and bold, creative and innovative thinking on the part of the World Bank and other premier financial institutions. The link between the Council, the Organization and those other financial institutions must be strengthened and deepened. We are all called on not only to be the makers and enforcers of peace, but also the sustainers of peace. Collectively, our actions as diplomats, politicians, ministers, representatives of civil society and citizens must make a difference.

I hope that the deliberations on the draft resolution will produce a resolution worthy of its name and worthy of the efforts of the members of the Advisory Group of Experts. We owe succeeding generations no less. The core objective of the Council's responsibility is the search for peace, and as members of the General Assembly, the principle organs and intergovernmental entities, we all must collectively assist the Council in the search for peace. We welcome once again the efforts of the Experts, but now it is the turn of the diplomats to match their work and also ensure that the search for peace is fully realized.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands): I align myself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union earlier today.

I will read out a shortened version of my statement in view of time constraints. The full version will be made available on my Twitter account.

Let me also thank the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for organizing this timely debate.

It is fitting that a neighbour of Colombia has invited Member States to reflect on the importance of peacebuilding. The recent history of that country shows that it takes political courage and perseverance to overcome obstacles to sustain sustainable peace in a country. The comments just made by our colleague from Sierra Leone are another positive example in that context.

Let me also thank Ambassador Macharia Kamau and Mr. Skoog for their briefings this morning. Furthermore, the King of the Netherlands welcomes the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts, which provides clear recommendations for improvement and reform in the practices of peacebuilding, and we pay tribute to the work, words and wisdom of Ambassador Gert Rosenthal and thank him very much. I will focus on three points: partnerships, coherence and peace operations.

When it comes to partnerships, peacebuilding can only be durable and inclusive if we view it as a partnership that involves all of those who have a stake in peace. We need not only the participation of the belligerent parties, but also that of local communities, local Governments, women, youth, business communities, regional organizations and non-governmental organizations. In our view, women's participation, as it has already been said today, is a condition for peace. We need to invite women to participate on panels and at negotiating tables, and we support the initiative of Mr. De Mistura to establish an independent women's advisory board in his Office. The Kingdom of the Netherlands strives to support partnerships for peacebuilding in practice. Since 2012, UNICEF has implemented an innovative programme known as the Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme, with the help of the Peacebuilding Support Office, and the Netherlands helped to make that programme possible. That partnership combined educational activities with academic development with a view towards peacebuilding and advocacy under national ownership, in conjunction with political efforts. It was implemented in 14 countries, including Pakistan, Uganda, Somalia and Liberia. It is an example of a coalition of stakeholders working towards the same goal: to give children and youth the tools to support peace in their country.

With regard to coherence, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers it of the utmost importance that the peacebuilding review be linked to the Secretary-General's review of peace operations, the review of resolution 1325 (2000) and the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1). Linking the recommendations of those crucial reviews and processes should ensure maximum coherence of United Nations actions. The high-level thematic debate in the General Assembly in May provides us with an opportunity to reflect on concrete ways of enhancing coherence within the United Nations system on the issues of peace and security. In addition, to prevent and effectively end conflicts the Security Council has a range of possibilities at its disposal. We welcome a more effective use of existing mechanisms, such as horizon scannings and briefings by Special Advisers and other bodies such as the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Department of Political Affairs. Furthermore, we believe that Resident Coordinators and Special Representatives should be accountable for the efforts of the United Nations during the entire cycle of conflict. Only this morning we hosted a meeting between the United Nations Development Programme and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to enhance their cooperation on the ground on rule- of law implementation in post-conflict situations. We must build bridges between the silos within the United Nations.

The third point on peace operations — during or after a conflict, a coherent United Nations strategy should focus on joint goals and deliverables, on the basis of a shared conflict analysis and with complementary roles for political, military, police and development instruments. In that context, we also see a close link between peace, justice and development.

In addition to supporting physical safety and political dialogue in conflict-affected States, the restoration of trust in the maintenance of law and order is of equal importance. Security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration are the main components of building peace. The police component in missions should be further developed. Resolution 2185 (2014), on the role of police in peace operations, underlines the fact that police organizations are the primary link between the Government and the community in the field of security. They also provide an essential element of the transition to stabilization.

In conclusion, I would like to refer to the draft resolution on the peacebuilding architecture now being negotiated in the General Assembly. In our view, the draft resolution should give a clear and actionable mandate to the Secretary-General aimed at overcoming silos and addressing the fragmentation within the United Nations system. We support the Ambassadors of Angola and Australia in their efforts made on behalf of that draft resolution.

The next points I am going to make were also just made by our colleague from Sierra Leone, namely, that peacebuilding activities are currently hampered by a lack of funding. In order for the Peacebuilding Fund to contribute substantively to peacebuilding efforts, it must be able to rely on more donors than the ones that are bearing the burden now. Aside from the Netherlands being a large donor, we advocate for more and more reliable funding and backstopping of special political missions, peacebuilding, conflict prevention and mediation, in the Fifth Committee and other forums.

Let me conclude by reiterating our strong support, as a partner of the United Nations for peace, justice and development, for the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Nkoloi (Botswana): Botswana congratulates your country Sir — Venezuela — on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We assure you of our support as you discharge your mandate.

We commend the Security Council for continuing to engage us in debates like this one, as they provide

Member States an opportunity to share views on various themes — for example, like today on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. We also thank the briefers for providing us with vital information this morning.

Pursuant to the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions that called for a comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture, the need to continuously re-examine and strengthen peacebuilding frameworks at national and international levels has become even more apparent. We applaud the efforts by the Secretary-General to institute such a review by appointing an Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, whose report (see S/2015/490) is the basis of our discussion here today.

It is the considered opinion of my delegation that the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office collectively play an important role in building and sustaining peace and international security. As we examine history, we acknowledge the fact that our continent, Africa, which has had its fair share of internal conflicts and strife, remains an integral part of the peace and security architecture. However, we believe that the fact that the majority of our post-conflict countries still remain fragile and increasingly vulnerable to be of significance. They very often have weak, or no, institutions of governance, the rule of law has broken down, any socioeconomic development capacity is absent and they need to be supported over long periods.

As history has shown, peacebuilding processes are themselves very complicated and need time to be consolidated. They need extensive and comprehensive patience to avoid the resurgence of violence and the reopening of healed wounds.We therefore regret that, even up to now, no proper or predictable funding mechanisms are established at regional and international levels to ensure that the seeds of sustained economic growth are safeguarded through reconstruction and a recovery period. We call on the international community, especially the United Nations system, to ensure proper coherence and coordination in promoting an efficient peace and security funding framework.

We note that the report of the Advisory Group of Experts has identified many shortcomings in the work of the peace and security architecture, not only at international and national levels but also within the United Nations system. My delegation therefore appreciates the contents of the report and believes that its recommendations deserve due consideration.

My delegation believes that, in order to promote growth and development, countries that are emerging from years of sustained conflict must as a matter of fact invest in instruments of peace, capacity-building, inclusive governance and very strong institutions. Therefore, we believe that the international community can share experiences and lessons with post-conflict countries in order to cultivate a culture of post-conflict reconstruction, maintaining peace, reconciliation and institution-building. In that regard, Botswana remains ready and willing to contribute in its own small way towards the strengthening of institutions of governance, particularly within the African continent.

We also note that the United Nations system is increasingly experiencing dwindling resources as it grapples with the rising tides of conflict across the globe. We therefore need to find creative ways of introducing predictable funding methodologies for peacebuilding initiatives to support the Peacebuilding Fund.

In conclusion, we commend all the work that has been achieved thus far with respect to the review of the peacebuilding architecture. While the achievement of international peace and security has at times proved elusive, Botswana remains firmly convinced that that can be achieved with concerted effort at the international level. In that respect, we reaffirm our abiding faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ecuador.

Mr. Morejón Pazmiño (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate. I very much appreciate what was said by Ambassador Kamau, Ambassador Skoog and Ambassador Rosenthal this morning, for it touched on the very essence of what we want to talk about today. I also want to stress the fact that Mr. Rosenthal has been present here right from the start of this morning's debate, a courtesy that I greatly appreciate. The United Nations was born on 24 October 1945 from the ashes of the Second World War to maintain international peace and security, one of its founding principles. Following the Holocaust, we regarded peace only as the absence of war. Nevertheless, in the twenty-first century, 70 years later, peace continues to be absent, since were it present then justice, dignity, development and the elements of the visionary Sustainable Development Goal 16 would all be present too. On the contrary, poverty, human rights violations and conflicts continue to affect ever greater populations. What is most serious is that those conflicts have become increasingly complex, ever more fragmented, more difficult and risk laden.

Such developments over time and the evolution of the contexts in which conflicts arise underscore the need for a change in the way peacebuilding is viewed. The Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture noted in its report (see S/2015/490) that the fundamental task of the United Nations — the maintenance of peace — does not receive due priority or adequate resources at the global level or within the United Nations system.

That statement compels my delegation to address the root causes of the Organization's inability to prevent the resurgence of the conflicts that have once again engulfed brotherly countries, posing major threats to, and resulting in serious consequences for, the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations and other international and regional actors, and in weaknesses and divisions not only within their own organizational structure but throughout the entire United Nations system. However, my delegation also recognizes the Organization's underlying concern about this important issue.

Twenty-four years ago, the then Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), defined and analysed post-conflict peacebuilding. To that end, several new initiatives have been taken, including the creation of the peacebuilding architecture. Recently we have seen the report of the Secretary-General entitled "The future of United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations" (S/2015/682) and the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (see S/2015/490). The latter contains substantive and analytical content on its findings and recommendations.

Let me briefly touch on just a few points. First, peace must be the common denominator of all of the Organization's activities. Second, we must shift the Organization's focus from response to prevention. Third, the task of maintaining peace means that the entire United Nations system, in particular its three main intergovernmental organs, must make the effort to accord it due priority and attention. Fourth, we must ensure more predictable funding for peacebuilding. The goal of $100 million is a disproportionate sum compared to the tremendous amount spent on the peacekeeping operations. My delegation believes that contributions to the fund could be both voluntary and quota-based. Fifth, there is a need to achieve broad and inclusive participation by the societies with which they work in the field. Sixth, we must ensure women's full participation in the entire peacebuilding process, from beginning to end. And seventh, the triangular relationship among peace, development and human rights means that all three of the Organization's components must work in close collaboration.

I conclude with a moral reflection by His Holiness John Paul II in his encyclical on peace: that we are duty-bound to build a peace that is sustainable over time and that requires us to be responsible in helping to build a decent society for humankind.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Grant (Canada) (*spoke in French*): The 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture, along with the concurrent reviews of peace operations and of resolution 1325 (2000), have enabled us to draw important and complementary conclusions. Preventing violent conflict and the achievement of sustainable peace must remain at the forefront of our efforts in the area of international peace and security. All three reviews provide us with an important opportunity to learn from years of experience and to reflect the growing global consensus that peace, stability and development are inextricably linked.

Canada believes that peacebuilding efforts must be in line with and in support of that concept in order to allow for better functioning at all stages of the conflict cycle. Indeed, we see peacebuilding as encompassing actions before, during and after conflict in order to maintain peace. That means that conflict prevention, including the prevention of the resurgence of a conflict, must be at the core of our peacebuilding efforts. To that end, it should be acknowledged that the root causes of and solutions to conflicts are political in nature.

We commend the Advisory Group of Experts for having clearly articulated that point and for making constructive recommendations in that regard in its report on the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (see S/2015/490). It is now incumbent upon Member States and organs of the United Nations to adopt and implement reforms that will revitalize the international community's ability to effectively prevent and respond to instability and conflict.

(*spoke in English*)

Canada deeply appreciates and supports the key elements of the draft resolution prepared by co-facilitators Angola and Australia on the 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture. The draft is substantive and ambitious, but realistic. We are encouraged by the wide-ranging level of engagement in this process to date and will continue to support the co-facilitators' efforts and to engage constructively with all Members. In particular, we wish to see reforms that will improve United Nations operational coherence, both in New York and in the field, enhance the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in conflict prevention and strengthen its efforts to advise the Security Council.

On this last point, Canada's experience as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific configuration on Sierra Leone has reinforced for us that the PBC has a particular role and added value in the design of mission mandates to ensure support for longer-term peacebuilding objectives. In this instance, the United Nations presence entailed a gradual drawdown from an integrated peacekeeping mission through different iterations of special political missions, to graduation from the Security Council's agenda. At the present time, the United Nations country team on the ground is working in close collaboration with and in support of the priorities of the Government of Sierra Leone.

Canada urges the Council to remain engaged in the ongoing peacebuilding review. Through close cooperation between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, we remain confident that we can operationalize concrete measures to enhance United Nations and international responses to the threat of violent conflict. Canada looks forward to continuing such discussions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to Mr. Koncke.

Mr. Koncke (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by thanking the presidency of the Security Council for having convened today's open debate on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. We also welcome the briefings made earlier today by the Permanent Representatives of Kenya and Sweden and Ambassador Rosenthal on the subject under discussion. Similarly, my delegation thanks and acknowledges the presidency for having directly inscribed the Organization of American States (OAS) on the list of speakers for today's open debate, without having each of its member States speaking on its own behalf.

The General Secretariat of the OAS shares the view that peacebuilding must be viewed as broadly and as comprehensively as possible. Peacebuilding cannot be regarded as a mere step in the post-conflict stage, as that would remove from the concept elements that must inevitably be taken into account in addressing the underlying causes of conflict. The mandate of the Charter of the United Nations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war can be achieved only through an integrated approach that allows for a thorough analysis and concrete action to prevent conflict. Although emergency actions taken to end crises and start immediate reconstruction efforts are absolutely necessary, it is in the stages prior to that outcome on which the international community should focus, by investing the political diplomatic capital and development efforts required.

The nexus between development and peacebuilding appears to be a pattern that should be highlighted and analysed. Without harmonious development that is sustainable and inclusive, achieving a society in which peacebilding can reach the necessary standards and levels of stability is unthinkable. The General Secretariat of the OAS is of the view that there can be no peacebuilding without the promotion and the protection of human rights. Any peacebuilding process will be inconclusive and lacking in foundation wherever the human rights of the population are not considered the main reason for action. Similarly, the role of women must be given special consideration in peacebuilding efforts.

With regard to the regional perspective, and in the context of the provisions of Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Organization of American States works with a vision to prevent, promote and protect rights, based on the premise of more rights for more people. One of the conclusions that we take away from the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts, as well as the tasks of the Peacebuilding

Commission, is the relevance of regional and subregional organizations in preventing and resolving conflicts, as well as in taking action in all pertinent phases. In that context, the Organization of American States relies on the legal tool under Article 52 of the Charter, the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Interamerican Democratic Charter, among other instruments.

Early detection of indicators of crises based on geographical and cultural proximity affords regional and subregional organizations the necessary perspective for playing a key role in this area. In that connection, in its role of regional organization, my delegation reiterates the statement made by Secretary-General Luis Almagro when he said that the OAS is fully committed to the peace process in Colombia, the last armed conflict in the region, with a view to a stable and lasting peace. By the same token, the General Secretariat of the OAS wishes to convey appreciation to the countries of the region, particularly Cuba and Venezuela, for their contributions to the peace process.

In the context of the confluence afforded by the review of the peacebuilding architecture, peacekeeping operations and resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security, my delegation considers that the common denominator of all these, beyond the specificities of each case, must be the priority of human rights. With that in mind, the General Secretariat of the OAS reiterates its enthusiasm to continue working jointly with the States parties of the Organization of American States and with the United Nations in hopes of achieving the set goals.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Rwanda.

Mr. Nibishaka (Rwanda): Let me join others in thanking you, Mr. President, for organizing this important open debate. I also thank all the briefers for their comprehensive presentations this morning. I am convinced that recommendations from discussions of this nature can significantly contribute to the improvement and streamlining of practices in peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction.

As all members know, my country went through a difficult process over the past 20 years from a post-conflict situation to become one of the main contributors to United Nations peace operations. Our experience alone is an indication that indeed post-conflict peacebuilding is an important process dealing with the aftermath of conflicts and conflict prevention, not to mention upholding the responsibility to protect. More often, however — peacebuilding, being both a political and a technical process — the United Nations has continued to struggle in matching the critical gap between applying existing top-down technical strategies and the political realities on the ground. In many cases post-conflict peacebuilding has been carried out as a purely operational process, using blueprints that stipulate what decisions must be established and what systems must be introduced, with technical aspects tending to take priority. The deteriorating situation in some countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) leads to questions as to whether local political mechanisms, capacities and country dynamics have been taken into account, and whether mechanisms have been put in place to safeguard their continued existence and avoid a relapse into conflict.

The situation in Burundi speaks for itself. Despite being on the PBC agenda for nearly 10 years, political and administrative weaknesses persisted and in 2015 the situation worsened and the country descended into political turmoil. While we embraced the concept of the responsibility to protect 10 years ago, in our understanding of State responsibility and the role of the international community in helping States to fulfil it, the fact that Burundi has now descended into an ever-greater spiral of violence has not helped make the case. With similar cases in the Central African Republic in 2015 and 2014, and the 12 April 2012 coup d'état in Guinea-Bissau, it appears that the PBC has not lived up to its projected role and it is far from reaching its full potential. Those cases also demonstrated that the international community in general, and the United Nations in particular, needed to adopt targeted post-conflict measures that address the root causes of political conflict while at the same time respecting the specificity of each situation, including the local political dynamics, cultural, religious and ethnic configurations and other elements that might play a critical role in post-conflict settings.

It has been consistently stressed by my delegation here, and in line with the report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of Peacebuilding Architecture, the work of the PBC should focus on the means and the potential available to the international community to support the locally driven and locally defined priorities, with a clear implementation plan and benchmarks to build inclusive local capacities. Inclusive national ownership and leadership are crucial prerequisites for sustainable post-conflict peacebuilding, as is highlighted in the report of the Advisory Group of Experts. Any peace process not endorsed by those who have to live with it is likely to fail. In that regard, we concur with the recommendations of the three reviews to directly involve women in setting peacebuilding priorities, identifying beneficiaries and monitoring implementation. In addition to the potential for women to contribute to successful peacebuilding, their participation should also be encouraged on the basis of fairness and justice.

We call for continued advocacy on behalf of the countries on the agenda and help underscore political and social economic progress to attract assistance and/or investment and to national priorities. Despite these challenges, in the country-specific configurations we are encouraged by efforts deployed by configuration Chairs, particularly increasing the visits to Burundi and the region to interact with various stakeholders, as well as the briefings to the Council and the configuration. We believe that the PBC, in supporting countries on its agenda, has a critical role to play in fostering regional engagement and commitment. In that respect, the PBC advisory function should also aim at forging interregional coherence through links with countries of the region and regional economic communities, as well as the African Union Peace and Security Council. I particularly thank those Chairs of the country-specific configurations who have integrated the regional dimension into their approach. These practices could provide an opportunity to increase awareness of the situation at hand and, where necessary, contribute to the accuracy of the information at the disposal of the United Nations that can allow appropriate action to be taken.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Begeç (Turkey): Turkey aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union. I should, however, like to make some additional comments in my national capacity.

We join others in appreciating the convening of today's debate and thank the briefers for their insightful remarks. We also thank the co-facilitators of the draft resolution — the representatives of Angola and Australia — for their transparent and inclusive work.

The United Nations has undertaken several review processes on how to better address the challenges to international peace and security. Turkey welcomes those processes and supports their key recommendations. However, it is also important that synergy and coherence be derived from them in order to give rise to cross-cutting and multidimensional solutions; otherwise we run the risk of fragmentation.

The report (S/2015/682) of the Secretary-General entitled "The future of United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations" and the report (S/2015/716) on the global study on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) have already contributed to the ongoing debates. Moreover, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1), in particular Sustainable Development Goal 16, has underscored the link between peace and development with an emphasis on conflict prevention, good governance and the rule of law.

Turkey has long advocated in favour of a stronger interrelationship between humanitarian and development perspectives. In our experience, humanitarian assistance delivered through development tools enhances recipients' resilience in facing recurrent crises. The World Humanitarian Summit to be held in Istanbul will enable all stakeholders to further assess this interrelationship.

The Organization devotes most of its energy and resources to crisis management. However, conflict prevention can be more efficient and cost-effective. As an important tool in recovery efforts, peacebuilding may well play a preventive role. In fact, peacebuilding — which is at the nexus of the three pillars of the United Nations — is applicable throughout the conflict cycle. Turkey supports United Nations efforts in using effective mediation tools for the purpose of conflict prevention, and regards United Nations peacebuilding capacity as a contribution to sustainable peace.

The Peacebuilding Commission plays an important role as a bridge between the principal United Nations organs — the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Turkey participates in five out of six country-specific configurations within the Commission. We therefore believe that, if given strategic guidance, the Commission can fulfil its mandate more effectively.

We should also find a way for allocating adequate resources to the Peacebuilding Fund. Peacebuilding is a political engagement with a broad scope of activities, including institution-building, which requires financial and human resources. With this understanding, Turkey supports the Fund with voluntary contributions. Likewise, activities such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and the promotion of human rights and the rule of law are heavily dependent upon United Nations support, and therefore require further resourcing.

The report (see S/2015/490) of the Advisory Group of Experts emphasizes the need for deeper cooperation between the United Nations and the international financial institutions. In that regard, cooperation with regional development banks could play a positive role in sustaining peacebuilding activities with a higher degree of ownership at the regional, national and local levels.

It is key to success in our peacebuilding and development endeavours to encourage the increased participation, inclusiveness and empowerment of all segments of society, notably women and youth, because social division and injustice will only harm the prospect for a culture of peace to flourish.

Last but not the least, the work of the Peacebuilding Support Office deserves more support and encouragement than it receives at present.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.7630

Security Council

Seventy-first year

Provisional

7630th meeting

Wednesday, 24 February 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Suárez Moreno	(Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))
Members:	Angola	Mr. Lucas
	China	Mr. Zhao Yong
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulatta
	France	Mrs Audouard
	Japan	Mr. Yoshikawa
	Malaysia	Mr. Ibrahim
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Senegal	Mrs. Diagne
	Spain	Mr. García-Larrache
	Ukraine	Mr. Vitrenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Ms. Sison
	Uruguay	Mr. Bermúdez

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 22 January 2016 from the Panel of Experts on Yemen established pursuant to Security Council resolution 2140 (2014) addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/73)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 22 January 2016 from the Panel of Experts on Yemen established pursuant to Security Council resolution 2140 (2014) addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2016/73)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2016/172, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/2016/173, which contains the text of a letter dated 22 January 2016 from the Panel of Experts on Yemen established pursuant to Security Council resolution 2140 (2014) addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Angola, China, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The draft resolution received 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 2266 (2016).

I shall now give the floor to the member of the Council who wishes to make a statement following the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Aboulatta (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): Egypt voted in favour of resolution 2266 (2016), which the Council just adopted unanimously. Allow me to take this opportunity to briefly reiterate the Egyptian Government's position with regard to sanctions regimes in general — as previously stated during our statement delivered at the Council's open debate (see S/PV.7620) on general issues related to sanctions held on 11 February — as well as Egypt's position with regard to the ongoing crisis in Yemen.

First, on the work of Panels of Experts, it is imperative that such panels operate within the mandate specified by the Security Council resolutions that established them, so as to preserve the resolutions' credibility and that of the Council itself.

Secondly, also with regard to the work of the panels, Egypt reiterates that it is vital that their final reports maintain objectivity and impartiality, and for those reports to rely exclusively on credible sources. We wish to highlight paragraph 11 of the resolution adopted today, which recalls the requirement I just mentioned. We reiterate the importance of strictly adhering to that in order, once again, to maintain the Council's credibility as well as the credibility of sanctions regimes.

Thirdly, as to the crisis in Yemen, we reaffirm Egypt's position calling for a political settlement to the crisis, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, especially resolution 2216 (2015). Only a political settlement will restore stability to Yemen and complement efforts to combat terrorism in that country in the Middle East region as a whole

The meeting rose at 10.10 a.m.

United Nations

S/PV.7631

Security Council

Seventy-first year

Provisional

7631st meeting

Wednesday, 24 February 2016, 10.10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Suárez Moreno	(Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))
Members:	Angola	Mr. Lucas
	China	Mr. Zhao Yong
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulatta
	France	Mr. Delattre
	Japan	Mr. Yoshikawa
	Malaysia	Mr. Ibrahim
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Senegal	Mr. Ciss
	Spain	Mr. Martínez Montes
	Ukraine	Mr. Vitrenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Ms. Power
	Uruguay	Mr. Rosselli

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 2139 (2014), 2165 (2014), 2191 (2014) and 2258 (2015) (S/2016/156)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

Accessible document

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 2139 (2014), 2165 (2014), 2191 (2014) and 2258 (2015) (S/2016/156)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Stephen O'Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2016/156, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 2139 (2014), 2165 (2014), 2191 (2014) and 2258 (2015).

I now give the floor to Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'Brien: Next month we will mark a grim anniversary. The brutal conflict will have torn Syria apart for five long years. It has been a relentless period of violence and destruction. The Syrian people have seen their country reduced to rubble, loved ones killed or injured and millions of people displaced either inside the country or in the region and beyond. They have suffered far too much and for far too long. The international community watched as Syria became one of the largest and most destructive crises of our times, with the majority of the population — some 13.5 million people — in dire need of protection and humanitarian assistance.

The announcement by the Chairs of the International Syria Support Group — the United States and the Russian Federation — of a nationwide cessation of hostilities, scheduled to come into effect this weekend, is a welcome development and a long-awaited signal of hope to the Syrian people. I echo the call of the Secretary-General for the parties to abide by the terms of the agreement, to bring about an immediate reduction in violence as a first step towards a more durable ceasefire and to create the conditions necessary for increased delivery of humanitarian aid.

I would like to take this opportunity to update the Council in detail on the most up-to-date information on humanitarian access.

As of 17 February, United Nations and Syrian Arab Red Crescent convoys had reached the following towns as part of the four towns agreement: 62 trucks to Madaya, reaching 40,000 beneficiaries; 3 trucks to Zabadani, reaching 1,000 beneficiaries; and 18 trucks to Fu'ah and Kafraya, reaching 20,000 beneficiaries. The convoys have preceded without any major security incident, although there have been delays in delivery as parties disagree over the terms of the agreement. The second and last part of the deliveries is tentatively planned for 28 February. The United Nations has supplies ready to be loaded and delivered. Facilitation by all parties, including the relevant letters from the Government of Syria, must be provided. As part of the agreements facilitated through discussions in Munich earlier this month, we have been able to deliver 62 trucks in Madimayet, reaching 40,000 people. There is another convoy planned through Madimayet, which must happen this week. Again, it requires facilitation by all parties, including the relevant letters from the Government.

Despite those achievements, the process of delivery has not been straightforward. For example, the second Madimayet convoy left the warehouse on Sunday, 21 February at 8 p.m. local time. By Tuesday at 1 a.m. local time, we still had trucks waiting outside the checkpoint to enter the town. Brave and dedicated humanitarian workers slept in trucks in adverse weather, waiting patiently to get help to the people that needed it. Eventually supplies were delivered, and the team worked through the night to unload the supplies. Their bravery and commitment is humbling, and I salute them all. I would like to remind the Council that Madimayet is a mere 15- to 20-minute drive from central Damascus. There is no reason that the mission should take over 48 hours to reach the people who need help. It is a clear violation of the safe, unhindered, unimpeded access that the Security Council has continually called for through its resolutions and other statements.

Finally, in Kafr Batna, in eastern Ghuta, 15 trucks delivered assistance to 10,000 people. Again, that was not without complications. My team received approval from the Government at 5.30 p.m. on 21 February to deliver assistance to over 44,0000 people in several towns in eastern Ghuta. After extensive negotiations, the United Nations team finally departed in the early afternoon on 23 February, and was only actually able to deliver to one town — Kafr Batna. The date of the next convoy is yet to be approved. Again, I insist on immediate approval to allow the convoys to deliver. We need immediate approval for the next round of convoys, which will deliver to eastern Ghutah, Homs, Aleppo and southern Syria.

Health supplies for some 30,000 people have been denied for the convoys by the Ministry of Health. The Resident Coordinator will submit an official request to the Government for all medical items that were removed to be included in future convoys. The Resident Coordinator is also putting together a proposal to the Government of Syria to reduce the number of procedures and the length of time needed for inter-agency convoys move. Humanitarian operations cannot continue to be bogged down by unnecessary and unacceptable restrictions, obstructions and deliberate delays that are costing people their lives. The number, scope and complexity of bureaucratic and other obstacles that are placed in the path of simple aid deliveries are staggering. To move a single truck, United Nations teams on the ground need to acquire multiple layers of approvals from officials at various different levels, necessitating repeated rounds of negotiations over everything from the target location, the amount and type of aid supplies, the date, the time and the route to take. When approvals are forthcoming, they are often not respected or adequately implemented. In order for people in dire need to receive the assistance they so desperately require, the system must be urgently simplified.

The United Nations has also begun to use airdrops as a means of humanitarian delivery in Syria. Although there are a number of operational risks associated with airdrops, we recognize that there are benefits to that approach in some areas of Syria as a last resort. Earlier this morning, a World Food Programme plane dropped the first cargo of 21 tons of items into Deir ez-Zor. We have received initial reports from the Syrian Arab Red Crescent team on the ground that pallets have landed in the target area as planned.

In summary, the United Nations and its partners have reached 110,000 people in besieged areas. We have approval to reach a further 230,000 people, including through the airdrops in Deir ez-Zor. But we are still waiting for approval for an additional 170,000 people. We expect those approvals to happen immediately. And, more broadly, the use of siege and starvation as a method of war must cease immediately. The main responsibility for doing so rests with the parties maintaining the sieges, but it is shared by those who put civilians in harm's way by using them as shields for military activities in besieged areas.

I cannot emphasize enough how high the stakes are at this moment in the conflict. The Syrian people — who are rightly sceptical of the international community's desire and ability to bring about an end to this hideous war after years of inaction — need to see an immediate difference in their daily lives on the ground because, up until this point, it is they who continue to bear the brunt of this crisis as violence has become more widespread, systematic and extreme. Since the start of the year, thousands of civilians have been killed, injured or displaced as a result of air strikes, barrel bombs, shelling, mortars, rockets, car bombs, improvised explosive devices and suicide attacks, day after day, right across the country.

This month alone, it is estimated that several hundred people have been killed and over 70,000 displaced due to intense aerial bombardment in Aleppo governorate. Heavy fighting and aerial bombardment also continued in other parts of the country, including parts of Idlib, Homs, rural Damascus and Dar'a. All too often, that included attacks on civilian infrastructure and basic services — including medical facilities, schools, bakeries, places of worship and internally displaced person camps, with a devastating impact on hundreds of thousands of civilians. On 15 February, on one single day, seven health-care facilities were attacked in Idlib, Aleppo and Dar'a, reportedly by Government and allied forces. Numerous civilians, including medical staff, were killed or injured, and the facilities largely destroyed. In Idlib alone it is estimated that some 40,000 people will be left without access to medical services as a result.

Groups designated as terrorist have similarly continued their indiscriminate attacks on civilian-populated areas. A few days ago, car-bomb attacks for which responsibility was claimed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant reportedly killed more than 155 people in Damascus and the city of Homs. In January, similar attacks in the same locations killed dozens more. Meanwhile, non-State armed groups have continued shelling populated areas of Damascus, killing and injuring many civilians over the past few weeks.

It is hard to believe that this conflict can be resolved as long as there continues to be a complete absence of protection for civilians. The agreement on a cessation of hostilities must finally and unequivocally produce what the Council's resolutions and the basic tenets and obligations that apply under international law have not been able to achieve so far — an immediate end to all targeted or indiscriminate attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure, and improved protection of civilians. Enough is enough. This brutality must be brought to an end.

Despite the intensified fighting, the United Nations and its partners have continued to scale up assistance to people in need, albeit at great personal risk to their staff. Last month, the United Nations and its partners reached millions of people in need with assistance through all available routes. The World Food Programme, for example, delivered food for 3.6 million people. UNICEF provided water, sanitation and hygiene supplies for more than 2 million people, and the World Health Organization delivered nearly 660,000 treatments.

This month, significant amounts of supplies were delivered through cross-border operations authorized by the Council. During the first three weeks of February, food assistance reached some 960,000 people, which represents a 48 per cent increase as compared to the same period in January. Health supplies were also delivered for some 300,000 people in February. Large, multi-truck convoys are crossing the three border crossings of Bab Al-Salam, Bab Al-Hawa and Ar Ramtha on a nearly daily basis. We will continue to stay and deliver, but we remain concerned about the impact of fighting and insecurity on humanitarian access and operational space, in particular to the eastern areas of the city of Aleppo. This fragile access to people in need must be safeguarded at all costs.

Let me be frank. While the United Nations and its partners are ready to take advantage of any opportunity to reach people in need, granting access should never be dependent upon political negotiations or ad hoc deals on the ground. The protection of civilians and the facilitation of humanitarian assistance are legal obligations that are incumbent upon all parties to the conflict at all times and for all types of assistance. That is a fundamental and irrefutable tenet of international humanitarian law and it must be respected. In that regard, I once again call urgently on the Government of Syria to approve without delay the more than 40 requests outstanding for inter-agency convoys to deliver assistance to hard-to-reach and besieged areas. I also call on non-State armed groups and listed terrorist groups to fulfil their obligations.

There are no winners in the Syrian conflict. Everyone is losing. But the highest price is being paid by Syrian men, women and children who are seeing their country, homes and families torn apart. This war has to end. As much as we try, the delivery of humanitarian assistance can address only the symptoms, not the root causes. The international community and the parties to the conflict must seize the momentum created around the nationwide cessation of hostilities to bring a political solution to the crisis. I cannot stress enough that we must not let this opportunity pass. We cannot take away that glimmer of hope from the people who need it most.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Under-Secretary-General O'Brien for his briefing.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Ja'afari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Mr. O'Brien has described a brutal situation in my country and I am in full agreement with his description. However, I differ with him in ascribing the manifestations and reasons for that brutality. Today I will therefore try to shed some light on the reality of that brutality, which is shedding my people's blood, destroying our infrastructure and bringing all kinds of terrorists to my country. As a matter of fact, this brutal situation has been contributed to by some States that sit on the Security Council.

It is regrettable that, despite the fact that about five years have passed since the crisis began in Syria, some Governments still insist on using the humanitarian situation as a justification in order to achieve their narrow political ends, as if the suffering of the Syrian people were a mere commodity to be used for trafficking and political blackmail by this or that Government. The extent of the hypocrisy and cheap political exploitation of human suffering may perhaps be made clear through the way in which those States treat the humanitarian situation in Syria by comparison to their treatment of such situations in other States.

The Security Council has adopted 15 resolutions on the situation in Syria, four of which relate to the humanitarian situation in the country. Every year it has held dozens of formal and informal meetings, now almost daily. However, in that time we have had no resolutions dealing with the disastrous humanitarian situations in Palestine, Libya, Yemen or Somalia, despite the fact that in one Security Council meeting Mr. O'Brien indicated that the humanitarian situation in Yemen was far worse than that in Syria: more than 80 per cent of the Yemeni people are in urgent need of humanitarian assistance.

As a Government, we cannot deny that there is a humanitarian crisis in Syria. Millions of people are displaced, refugees or disadvantaged. However, we deplore the mistaken way that the crisis has been dealt with so far. Looking at the situation from a partial perspective, in isolation from the external, political, military and economic interference in Syria, we do not deny the depth of the humanitarian crisis, as the Council well knows. However, we reject any suggestion that it can be dealt with seriously without dealing with the origins of and reasons for the crisis, which are rooted in the spread of armed terrorist groups supported from outside and their proliferation in our villages and cities while using civilians as human shields.

The Under-Secretary-General called such externally supported armed terrorist groups "non-State armed groups". We have witnessed no humanitarian crisis anywhere apart from the areas that those terrorist groups have entered. Adding insult to injury is the fact that some States have imposed unilateral coercive measures on the Syrian people, thereby aggravating our suffering. In that regard, it is incomprehensible that some insist on denying the role of the Syrian Government, attempting to portray it as primarily responsible for the humanitarian crisis, as we heard just now in Mr. O'Brien's statement. The height of the paradoxical nature of this scenario is reached when some accuse the Syrian Government of besieging some areas with the aim of starving its own people.

However, they are unable to stop the continued outflow of armed terrorists and the financial support provided to them in the regions that they claim are being besieged by our Government. Those terrorist groups launch rocket attacks indiscriminately at civilian areas and carry out suicide bombings, as happened in Homs, Rif Dimashq and Hasakah. Other areas, such as Kafraya and Fu'ah, and, for the past three and a half years Dayr ez-Zor and Zahra, are besieged from the outside by terrorist groups, while others, such as in Madimayet, Madaya and Duma, are besieged internally by terrorists. The terrorists prevent the entry of humanitarian assistance or seize it for their own use or to resell it to civilians. We have not seen any images of so-called moderate terrorists starving. Have representatives ever seen in the media an image of a hungry terrorist in Syria? No, only the civilians are hungry. Terrorists are not hungry because they receive dollars and weapons. They come from all over the world and do not go hungry. However, civilians inevitably go hungry.

It has become clear that, in order to improve the humanitarian situation in Syria comprehensively and in a sustainable manner, the Government must abandon that misguided and failed approach. How can we put an end to the humanitarian crisis in Syria while the Erdoğan regime remains silent about the military attacks against the Syrian territories, uses Turkish territory, including the crossings used by the United Nations to provide humanitarian assistance, as a passageway for the transit of thousands of foreign terrorist fighters, supplies and weapons, and even uses humanitarian assistance convoys to hide them? That regime imprisons customs officers, judges and journalists who expose it. How can the humanitarian crisis be brought to an end when the Erdoğan regime brazenly uses the plight of refugees to blackmail European States to gain political and financial support?

Regrettably, some States on the Security Council provide cover for the Erdoğan regime. A few days ago those States refused a balanced draft resolution emphasizing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria and rejecting external interference in its affairs and in the outflow of refugees. Those are all universally agreed principles that nobody can deny. However, after the adoption of 15 Security Council resolutions on Syria, some are trying complicate matters. It is as if Syria were seeking another five years to prudently analyse what is happening in its territory.

The Syrian Government is eager to extend all types of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians affected by the crisis wherever they are in its territory. That is our duty and we are committed to it. Therefore, the Syrian Government is open to coordinating and cooperating with all States, United Nations entities, including the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and other international organizations working in Syria to carry out that process, without propaganda or attempts to demonize the Syrian Government. It is clear that our Government is doing its best to deliver assistance to its citizens wherever they are.

As a demonstration of this, the Syrian Government informed the United Nations on 16 February that it had agreed to allow the entry of humanitarian assistance convoys to Dayr ez-Zor, Kafraya, Fu'ah, Madaya, Madimayet, Zabadani and Kafr Batna. Those convoys are a continuation of other convoys that have already reached those regions and other areas and illustrate my Government's intention to facilitate the delivery of assistance to all people in need wherever they are in Syria. That was also emphasized by the Minister for Foreign affairs to Mr. De Mistura at his latest meeting with him in Damascus. The delay in providing consent and the so-called administrative bureaucracy mentioned by Mr. O'Brien is an indication of our eagerness to ensure the safety and security of humanitarian workers. We care about their safety and security and do not want any harm to befall them, such as, for example, a suicide bomber exploding himself in front of a humanitarian convoy vehicle. Yet, we are now back in the Council and are hearing a different description about what is happening.

Resolving the Syrian crisis requires two simultaneous approaches: first, combating terrorism and, secondly, a political approach. Based on that, the Syrian Government is committed to combating terrorism and is pressing ahead with a political approach. The delegation of Syria participated in the Geneva talks and demonstrated its seriousness and commitment to the talks, as witnessed by the Special Envoy himself. The problem there was that some States imposed the so-called Riyadh delegation as the sole negotiator with the single goal undermining those talks by means of direct instructions from those actors, in addition to considerable procedural gaps, in particular when it came to the representation of all elements of Syrian society outside and inside Syria. Those factors led to the failure of the most recent round of Geneva talks.

We are now demonstrating our seriousness and willingness to curb the bloodshed, restore security and stability and implement the will of our people to preserve our territorial integrity. We agreed to the cessation of hostilities agreement on the basis of the continuation of political efforts to combat the terrorism perpetrated by Da'esh, the Al-Nusra Front and other terrorist organizations, in accordance with the Russian and American announcement.

We are cooperating with the Russian side to determine the groups and areas that will be covered by the cessation of hostilities agreement. In that regard, we underscore the need to establish control over the borders, in particular the Syrian/Turkish border, and to put an end to the support provided by some States to the terrorist organizations, which enables them to build their capacities, in order to avoid jeopardizing that agreement. We emphasize the right of our armed forces to deter any violation by those groups against our Syrian citizens or our armed forces.

The ball is in the court of the other parties who still support terrorism, a military escalation and external interference and undermine the achievement of a political solution by imposing unacceptable preconditions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.7632

Security Council
Seventy-first year

Provisional

7632nd meeting
Friday, 26 February 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Ramírez Carreño	(Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))
Members:	Angola	Mr. Lucas
	China	Mr. Zhao Yong
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulatta
	France	Mr. Bertoux
	Japan	Mr. Yoshikawa
	Malaysia	Mr. Ibrahim
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Senegal	Mr. Seck
	Spain	Mr. De la Calle García
	Ukraine	Mr. Yelchenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Mr. Pressman
	Uruguay	Mr. Rosselli

Agenda

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

Report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and the activities of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau (S/2016/141)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

16-05211 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

Report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and the activities of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau (S/2016/141)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2016/183, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Angola, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2016/141, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on developments in Guinea-Bissau and the activities of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

In favour:

Angola, China, Egypt, France, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The draft resolution received 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 2267 (2016).

I shall now give the floor to the member of the Council who wishes to make a statement following the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Seck (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I would like to say how pleased I am that my delegation was given the honour and the privilege of sponsoring resolution 2267 (2016), which the Security Council has just adopted unanimously. On behalf of the entire Senegalese delegation, I should like to thank all the members of the Council and to express our gratitude for members' cooperation and constructive contributions in the course of the negotiations that led to this resolution. I would especially like to thank the experts, who displayed a spirit of consensus and determination during the negotiations.

The resolution we have just adopted takes note of the report (S/2016/141) of the Secretary-General on Guinea-Bissau dated 12 February. It also expresses the Council's full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, whose mandate has been extended, as well as that of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau until 28 February 2017.

More specifically, the Council once again expresses its concerns about the ongoing political and institutional tensions among the President, the Prime Minister, the Speaker of Parliament and political leaders, which has significantly slowed the reforms under way. In that context, the resolution emphasizes the need to respect democratic principles, the separation of powers and the rule of law, as well as the importance of national reconciliation, an inclusive dialogue, good governance, justice and the fight against impunity.

Through the resolution, we welcome the non-interference by the defence and security forces in the political arena, as well as the peaceful behaviour of the population of Guinea-Bissau. The Council also welcomes the steps taken by the President of Senegal in his capacity as the Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Guinean President, the ECOWAS Mediator for Guinea-Bissau, and the Special Envoy of the Nigerian President and all other interlocutors in the search for a peaceful solution to the impasse in the country. The resolution also welcomes the efforts of ECOWAS to achieve peace, security and sustainable development, in particular through the efforts of the ECOWAS Mission in Guinea-Bissau (ECOMIB).

The resolution also launches an appeal — which I should like to repeat here — to bilateral, regional and international partners to provide support to ECOWAS in order to renew the mandate of ECOMIB, above all in order to finance it. I should solemnly like to call on the Security Council and all bilateral partners to facilitate and support the mobilization of assistance to

Guinea-Biassau at this crucial time in its history, first and foremost in the interests of the civilian population.

The meeting rose at 10.10 a.m.